











# **INDIAN NATIONALISM AND ASIA**

**(1900-1947)**

**BIREDNRA PRASAD**

**B. R. PUBLISHING CORPORATION  
DELHI-110052**

**First Published, 1952**

***Distributors :***

**D.K. PUBLISHERS' DISTRIBUTORS,  
1, Ansari Road,  
New Delhi-110002**

***Publishers :***

**B.R. PUBLISHING CORPORATION,  
461, Vivekanand Nagar,  
Delhi-110052**

***Printers :***

**ASHOKA PRINTERS,  
17, Sri Nagar Colony,  
Bharat Nagar Road,  
Delhi-110052.**

## PREFACE

SINCE INDIA became independent in August 1947, she strained every nerve to remain at friendly terms with the countries of Asia and to co-operate with them on common problems. This was, to a considerable extent, the outcome of the commitments of the Indian National Movement which believed that such a path alone could ensure world peace and contribute to the general well-being of the people of the Asian continent and liquidate Western domination from Asia. To understand properly free India's Asian policy, it becomes, therefore, imperative to study the attitude of the Indian National Movement towards the nations of Asia and their freedom struggles. The present work provides an historical background to the study of India's policy towards the countries of the Asian continent.

There was lack of a systematic study on the subject before the publication of the scholarly work entitled *The Origins of Indian Foreign Policy*, written by Dr. Bimal Prasad. But his work has certain limitations. He has confined himself to the resolutions of the Indian National Congress to trace the origin of Indian outlook on world problems. He has not been exhaustive in his treatment of India's attitude towards Asian countries. Moreover, he could not pay attention to the several other political associations which also evolved certain principles governing India's attitude towards Asian people during the period under review. Furthermore, the scholar kept the editorials of the newspapers and informed public opinion reflected through mass meetings and demonstrations outside the scope of his work. Some scattered references of Indian attitude towards Asian countries are to be found in the works entitled *India and Regional Integration in Asia* and *Indian Nationalism vs. International Communism*, written by Sisir Gupta and J. Bandyopadhyay respectively. Iqbal Singh in his book entitled *India's Foreign Policy* discussed very briefly the growth of foreign-affairs mindedness among the people of India. Werner Levi's praiseworthy book entitled *Free India in Asia* discussed in brief the attitude of Nationalist India towards Asian neighbours and the attempts made by Indian leaders to promote Asian solidarity. G.H. Jansen's work (*Afro-Asia and Non-Alignment*) referred to the growth of Asianism in Indian nationalist thinking but he was also very handy in his treatment. None of these works deals with Asianism as a marked feature of Indian nationalist thinking in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

The present work is an humble attempt to fill up those gaps and to discuss in detail the attitude of the Indian National Movement towards the Asian problems and Asian freedom struggle and also those Asian events and movements which influenced the Indian nationalists during the struggle for independence.

Indian attitude towards Asian people was made known through the resolutions of the various political associations, writings and speeches of the nationalist leaders, public meetings and the newspapers. Most Asian-conscious association was the Indian National Congress which also spearheaded the struggle for Indian freedom. Beside it, there were some other associations which, too, spoke of the inherent unity of Asia or Asian solidarity. These associations included the All India Women's Conference, the All India Kisan Conference, the All India Liberal Federation, the All India Trade Union Congress, the Provincial Conferences, the All India Khilafat Conference, the All India Ahrar Conference etc. which took casual interest in the affairs of the Asian nations. I have ventured to include in this study the outlook of the All India Muslim League. The sole justification for the inclusion of the Muslim League is the fact that the study of the Indian National Movement, which was not an unified movement, would remain incomplete without the study of the Muslim League which enjoyed the support of the bulk of the Muslim population of India. The Muslim League lacked foreign-affairs mindedness but it evinced keen interest in the Muslim countries of Asia with whom the Muslims of India had cultural and sentimental attachment.

The Hindu Mahasabha, which was formed primarily to protect Hindu interests, did not take much interest in Asian countries but sometimes it expressed its view on some Asian problems. Wherever its policies were similar to those of the nationalist front, such reference had been also included in this work.

While making attempts to analyse the attitude of the Indian National Movement towards the Asian people, I have excluded Soviet Russia from the scope of this study because Soviet Russia is more an European than an Asian power although seven of her republics are in Asia. Again, Indian attitude towards Turkey had been dealt with till the abolition of the Caliphate by Kemal Pasha who declared Turkey to be a European nation.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I HAVE no words to express my deep sense of gratitude to Dr. Shyam Bihari Singh, Professor and Head of the Department of History, Magadh University, Bodh-Gaya, who initiated me into research and encouraged me to pursue this work. I am extremely beholden to him for the constant guidance, assistance and patronage which I received from him during the preparation of this work. It would have rather been difficult for me to complete this burdensome work without the invaluable co-operation and guidance which Dr. Singh made available to me whenever I approached him. My debt to him is incalculable.

I do not know how to thank Dr. K.K. Datta, ex-Vice-Chancellor, Patna and Magadh Universities, who gave me valuable suggestions on various occasions. I shall be failing in my duty if I do not express my deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Dina Nath Verma, Reader in History, Patna University, who suggested me this topic. I am also thankful to Prof. Aditya Nath Mishra and Dr. D.N. Mallik of Bihar University, Muzaffarpur, for their kind and valuable suggestions. My special thanks are due to Dr. R.N. Prasad, Dr. R.S. Bahadur, Dr. S. Roy, Smt. Shanti Singh of my department. I can not forget my friends, Prof. Kunwar Deo Prasad, Prof. Manager Prasad, Prof. Upendra Prasad Singh, Dr. Y.K. Mishra, Shri R.P. Singh and Shri Surendra Prasad Singh who always inspired and goaded me to complete the work.

I am also thankful to the authorities of the Mannu Lal Magadh University Library (Bodh-Gaya), Public Library (Gaya), Sinha Library (Patna), Patna University Library, National Library (Calcutta), National Archives of India (New Delhi) and Sapru House Library (New Delhi) for their help and co-operation in the preparation of this work.

My thanks are due to Shri Mohan Singh who spared no pains to type this thesis in a very nice manner and that too in a very short period.

# CONTENTS

	PAGES
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
I Growth of Nationalism in India	1
II Indian Nationalism and Emergence of Asian Consciousness	23
III Indian Nationalism and Asia 1900-18	35
IV From Dominion to Independence Resolution and the Attempts—made to Promote Asian Solidarity (1919-29)	69
V Consolidation of the Indian National Movement and Attempts for Asian Solidarity (1930-45)	118
VI Last Phase of India's Freedom Struggle and the Zenith of Indian Attempts for (Asian Solidarity 1945-47)	190
VII Conclusion	228
BIBLIOGRAPHY	233
INDEX	252

## **CHAPTER I**

# **GROWTH OF NATIONALISM IN INDIA**

**GROWTH OF Nationalism in India formed a brilliant chapter of Indian History. If the story of the rise and growth of British Imperialism in India was fascinating, no less interesting is the story of the revolt and development of National Movement in India. Beyond doubt, the national awakening in India has been the greatest single development in the first half of the 20th century, although it had its germination in the last quarter of the 19th century. As a matter of fact the 19th century marked the Zenith of British Imperialism in India and also at the same time the beginning of the end of the British Empire in India.**

**The growth of nationalism in India was the result of the interaction and intermingling of various factors—social, religious, cultural, political, economic and spiritual racial, and of the Western and Eastern, the foreign and indigenous origin. Indian Nationalism had both an element of response and challenge. It was a challenge to British domination of India and it was a response in so far as India derived her inspirations from Western learning and liberalism.**

**The alien rule itself was basically responsible for the growth of Indian Nationalism. In a sense, political awakening in India was a natural reaction against the aggressive British imperialism and oppressive British Rule. Despite the declaration of the Charter of 1833 and Queen's proclamations of 1858 that Indians would be given better treatment and would not be discriminated against, nothing was done to give better treatment to them. Higher services remained the close preserve of the Europeans As late as 1915 only five per cent of the posts of the superior civil services were occupied by Indians.<sup>1</sup> The security of the Empire rested on the Civil Services and therefore Indians were not entrusted with responsible post. Sir John Strachey stressed the need that the Civil Services must remain British.<sup>2</sup> This policy of keeping the civil services, the steel preserve of the Englishmen, caused a reaction against the British domination.**

**Furthermore, the British Government was an autocracy tempered by the rule of law but governing without any system of representation. Times and again, it was declared that self-rule or representative government was not meant for Indians. Sir Henry Maine could see no place for representative institutions in India.<sup>3</sup> Lytton wrote to Sir E. Perry on April 18, 1877, "We hold India as a conquered country. . . . which must be governed in all essentials by the strong, unchallenged, hand of the conquering power".<sup>4</sup> The natives were considered unsuitable for important and responsible administrative posts. A.O. Hume, usually known as the**

originator of the Congress in India, considered the government, 'seems to be a great, cruel, blundering machine, running on by its own weight'.<sup>5</sup> The alien rule and its bureaucrats were indifferent to the sentiments of the people. Had the bureaucracy in India taken a milder policy towards the natives there would not have been a wide gap between the rulers and the ruled. Bernard Houghton very rightly pointed out that bureaucratic governments in India, whether imperial or provincial, by their determined opposition to the demands of the people for a share in the government of the land, had aroused a spirit of patriotism, a will for self-sacrifice, a zeal for the greatness of their country which had transformed and exalted their lives.<sup>6</sup> Lord George Hamilton looked upon the Congress movement as an uprising of Indian native opinion, not against British Rule, but Anglo-Indian bureaucracy.<sup>7</sup> Morley, the British Secretary of State for India, regarded bureaucracy in India as the real danger to the British Empire in India.<sup>8</sup>

A vital factor which aroused the people of India was racial discrimination of the British Rule which was imbued with strong consciousness of colour and nationality. British people considered themselves superior to the Indians<sup>9</sup> and non-official Englishmen in India despised the Indians.<sup>10</sup> Indians were termed as "*nigger*"<sup>11</sup> and the European masters perpetrated severe cruelties on the natives. Even the middle and lower classes of Europeans in India considered themselves a *Sahib*<sup>12</sup> and remained aloof from the Indians.<sup>13</sup> Sir William Russell had mentioned numerous cases of ill-treatment and humiliation of the Indians.<sup>14</sup> Charles Dilke, who made a trip to India in 1867, also admitted that the conduct of non-official Englishmen in India was highly distressing.<sup>15</sup> Sir Henry Cotton mentioned the abuses, insults and assaults hurled upon the native population by the British officials as well as non-officials and pointed out that the more educated the Indian, the more he was disliked by Englishmen, for he wanted to be treated as an equal<sup>16</sup> by those who were taught to regard themselves as gentlemen engaged in the magnificent work of "*Governing an inferior race*".<sup>17</sup> Such an attitude created a wide gulf between the natives and the foreigners. The result was that the feelings of bitterness between the rulers and the ruled prevailed and went on ever widening.

Thus *hard, much more harsh* British Rule than that of the Company's Raj,<sup>18</sup> the obstinate bureaucracy and the ill-treatment of the Indians at the hands of the Whitemen in India, the autocratic nature of the British Government and its denial of the system of representation to the Indian people awakened the Indians to their humiliating status in the British system and the result was national consciousness in India. Madan Mohan Malaviya truly represented the Indian feeling when he asked the British to grant representative institutions to India as they had conceded the same to Canada and Australia.<sup>19</sup> The main demands of the early nationalists were the extensive employment of Indians in the higher administrative posts and the steady development of representative institutions in India but the British rejected both the demands which created a dislike for the British Rule in India.

The British Rule, which was denounced by Dadoba Pandurang Tarkhadkar in 1841 as the "*most bitter curse India has ever been visited with*,"<sup>20</sup> and by Bal Gangadhar Tilak as "*a predatory foreign incubus rather than a blessing*,"<sup>21</sup> also helped the growth of national consciousness in India by the administrative and economic unification of India under British Rule. Before the advent of the British,

the people of India had thought of themselves in terms of regions they came from, rather than as Indians. Regional feelings had increased so much that the British historians Seely<sup>22</sup> and Strachey<sup>23</sup> described India as a mere geographical expression. The improvements in communications, such as roads and railways, good postal and telegraph services, introduction of English as the *lingua franca* for the whole country by the British brought people from distant parts of India closer and made the people think themselves as one nation and helped the growth of nationalism on an all-India basis. Even the nationalist leader like Dadabhai Naoroji appreciated the British Rule for joining together the different parts of India and admitted in his presidential address to the Indian National Congress held in 1886 that no such congress could have been convened at any time in the past either in the days of Vikram during Hindu rule or during the rule of Akbar in the Muslim period.<sup>24</sup>

Christian Missionaries and their activities also stimulated national consciousness among the Indians. They opened schools for the spread of education and advocated various reforms in the social and religious life of India. It was also through them that liberal principles of the West were brought to the natives which helped the movement for self rule and representative institutions. Debendra Nath Tagore,<sup>25</sup> N.G. Chandavarkar<sup>26</sup> and Lajpat Rai<sup>27</sup> appreciated the role of the Christian Missionaries in making the people alive to the social and religious needs. If the Christian Missionaries stimulated a new consciousness among the Indians by the spread of education and by making Indians familiar with the liberal principles of the West, they also challenged some of the assumptions of Hindu religion and Hindu social system. This created a reaction among the Indians who came forward to defend their system by removing some of the ills of the Indian Society. The fear of Christian Missionaries led to the beginning of much social wisdom among the Indians.<sup>28</sup> Indians, thus, awakened became conscious of their interests.

Economic grievances played a dominant role in fostering anti-British feeling among the Indian people because the Indian nationalists held the view that under British Rule Indians suffered from economic domination even more than from political domination<sup>29</sup> and they were of the firm opinion that if they were given the option to choose between political and economic *swaraj* they would certainly choose economic *swaraj*.<sup>30</sup>

In the beginning the Indian nationalists were much impressed by the introduction of railways, postal services and other benefits of the British Rule in India. Leaders like G.K. Gokhale spoke of the British connection as providential.<sup>31</sup> Dadabhai Naoroji declared that Indians were attached to "this foreign rule with a deeper loyalty than even to our past native rule."<sup>32</sup> But soon the situation changed. Naoroji, who had promised "deeper loyalty," began to be disloyal and in 1901 he declared that the Indians had stood their exploitation by the British too long and warned the British that it would be wrong assumption that their loyalty could not fail, that it would not continue in the same condition in which it was at the present.<sup>33</sup> Why this change? The reason was that Indian leaders gradually understood that the British claim, that India had made material progress under the British Rule was a myth. Tilak wrote in 1893: "How the people were dazzled at first by the discipline of the British. Railways, Telegraph, Roads, Bridges and Schools bewildered the people. Riots ceased and people could enjoy peace and calm. People began

to say that even a blind person can safely travel from Benaras to Rameshwar with gold tied to a stick. But as the influence of the wine does not last long this illusion arising out of the revolution did not last long. The blind man may travel with gold tied to his stick but day-by-day people realised that gold was getting scarce.”<sup>34</sup> Indian leaders began to talk of the poverty of the people. G.S. Iyer considered poverty of India to be the root evil of the whole economic condition of India”<sup>35</sup> and B.C. Pal wrote in 1901 that of all the perplexing problems that confronted India, the economic problem was the most pressing<sup>36</sup> and Naoroji complained that India was sinking in poverty.<sup>37</sup> R.C. Dutt declared in 1901 that the poverty of Indian population was unparalleled in any civilised country.<sup>38</sup>

For all this Indian leaders held the alien domination responsible. They thought that the economic ruin of India was the result of a mercantilist British policy which had made Indian economy subordinate to the British economy. Surendra Nath Banerjee emphatically stated that it had been the settled policy of England in India ever since her rise in political power to convert India into a land of raw produce for the benefit of the manufacturers and operatives of England.<sup>39</sup> Anti-Indian economic policies of the British India Government resulted in the decline of all indigenous arts and industries which caused the poverty of the Indian people. In view of the free trade policy in 1879 Lord Lytton exempted all the imported cotton goods containing no yarn finer than produced in India from duty. This led the Indian leaders to think that Britain pursued a deliberate policy of stamping out India’s Industries.

Indian leaders and Press attacked this measure of the Government of India. Public meetings were held in Bombay<sup>40</sup> and Calcutta<sup>41</sup> to protest against the action of the Government of India. People were heavily taxed, and the money collected was drained out of the country in the form of the salary of the civil servants. In the very first session of the I.N.C., Naoroji accused the rulers of screwing out more and more taxes, like squeezing a squeezed orange—inflicting suffering and distress.<sup>42</sup> Economic grievances of the Indian people found vent in the drain theory which revealed that a greater part of India’s national wealth or total annual product was being exported to England for which India received no economic returns or benefits. Naoroji declared in 1867 that out of revenues raised in India nearly one-fourth goes clean out of the country and is added to the resources of England as a result of which India was *being continuously bled*.<sup>43</sup> R.C. Dutt claimed that nearly one half of India’s net annual revenue flowed out of the country in the form of salaries to the British officers and the purchase of manufactured goods and *the moisture of India blesses and fertilises other lands*.<sup>44</sup>

The deteriorating economic position of the country and the anti-national economic policy fanned anti-British feeling. An Indian paper, the Satya Mitra, dated February 9, 1888 warned the British Government to bear in mind that even the meak cow can, if enraged, tear the elephant to pieces or will kick the milkman if he attempts to milk after she has yielded the whole of the milk in her udder.<sup>45</sup> Indian people rallied to the support of Naoroji’s thesis that without “Self-Government the Indians can never get rid of their present drain, and the consequent impoverishment, misery, and destruction. No palliative of any kind whatever, no more alteration and tinkering of the mechanical machinery of administration, can and will do any good at all. The drain can only be stopped by the government, by

the people themselves.. Self-government is the only remedy for India's woes and wrongs.<sup>46</sup> These statements stirred the minds of the Indian people and became the guidelines for the Indian nationalists.

If the British reduced Indian people to a *dead level mass of labourers*,<sup>47</sup> Western education infused a new life into the dead bones of the Indian Nation.<sup>48</sup> To a great extent, Indian nationalism was the foster-child of Western education. Through their knowledge of English language Indians from different parts of the country were able to discuss things together and create a sense of national consciousness.

Long before Salisbury had warned that the newly educated Indians cannot be anything else than an opposition in quiet times, rebels in time of trouble.<sup>49</sup> Lord Salisbury's fear was genuine. Western education acquainted the Indians with the progressive political theories of Bentham, J.S. Mill, Rousseau, Spencer and created a ferment in India.<sup>50</sup> The revolutions and the liberalism of the 19th century Europe quickened the national upsurge and inspired the Indians to demand for the application of those liberal principles in India. In their presidential addresses for the I.N.C. in 1895 and 1897 Surendra Nath Banerjee<sup>51</sup> and Sankaran Nair<sup>52</sup> respectively admitted that it was English education that had taught the Indians to ask for constitutional reforms. John Stuart Mill's saying that "The Government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality but such a thing as government by one people over another does not and cannot exist" became an ideal for the educated Indians. "English education," Jawaharlal Nehru significantly observed, "widened the Indian horizon and created an admiration for English literature and institutions, a revolt against some customs and aspects of Indian life and a growing demand for political reforms".<sup>53</sup> Long before in 1885 Henry Cotton had pointed out that a feeling of nationality was fast developing in India mainly as a result of English education and that the emancipation of India had become inevitable ever since a system of English education was established.<sup>54</sup> Under the influence of the liberal and democratic principles filtered into India through Western education Indian nationalists started their struggle against the alien rule and the early Congress leaders were largely inspired by the large hearted liberalism of the 19th century English politics.<sup>55</sup>

Nationalism always thrives on past memories and achievements. It was more so in the case of India which had a rich historical tradition and culture. At a time when Sir Henry Maine, a member of the Governor-General's Council from 1862-69, was speaking very low of Indian people<sup>56</sup>, the re-discovery of the glorious past of Indian civilisation and culture in the late 19th century questioned the hypothesis that Britain represented a higher civilisation and that the West had a civilising mission in India and infused a fresh vigour in the Indian people. Sir Charles Wilkins, Sir William Jones, H.H. Wilson, Maxmuller, Bopp, Cunningham, Sir John Marshall, Rajendra Lal Mitra, M G Ranade, B G. Tilak, R.G. Bhandarkar, R.D. Banerjee, K. T. Telang and Raj Narain Bose through their endless endeavours discovered the glories of the ancient Hindus in art, literature, religion, civilisation and culture. "This revelation," observed by R.C. Majumdar, "could not fail to stir deeply the hearts of Indians, with the results that they were imbued with a spirit of nationalism and ardent-patriotism."<sup>57</sup> "The awakening of India," truly observed Jawaharlal Nehru, 'was of two folds. She looked to the West and at the same time, she looked at herself and her own past for inspiration.'<sup>58</sup>

The Indian press played an important part in promoting national spirit in India. Newspapers—*The Indian Mirror*, *The Bombay Samachar*, *The Hindu*, *The Hindoo Patriot*, *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, *The Keshari*, *The Bengalee*, *The Indu Prakash*, *The Hitavadi*, *The Mahratta*, *The Bihar Herald*, *The Yugantar*, *The Tribune*, *The Leader* and several others, educated the Indian Public opinion, made the people familiar with the ills of the government, put forward the demand for self-rule, supported the nationalist organisations in their programmes and protested against the repressive and exploitative character of the British Rule and in doing so helped the cause of the nationalist movement and served the *role of a constitutional opposition*.<sup>59</sup> Such a tremendous role was played by the Indian Press in creating national consciousness that Sir Thomas Munro<sup>60</sup> and Mountstuart Elphinstone<sup>61</sup> expressed the fear that a free press and a foreign Rule could not exist together. If the Indian Press played a praiseworthy role in arousing national consciousness no less significant was the part of popular literature in creating a passion for national freedom and in stimulating dormant souls of millions of India. Dinbandhu Mitra's *Nil Dahan* contributed to the resurgence of modern India.<sup>62</sup> The national lyrics of Hem Chandra Banerjee whom Aurobindo Ghosh called "*one of the mightiest prophets of Indian Nationalism*,"<sup>63</sup> Championed the legitimate rights of the Indians and inspired all the nationalist leaders.<sup>64</sup> The writings of Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Rajendra Lal Mitra, Raj Narain Bose, Bhudev Mukhopadhyay, Madhusudan Dutta, Dwijendra Nath Tagore, Ranglal and Govinda Chandra Roy appealed to the dumb millions of India to be ready to liberate the motherland from the immeasurable pathos.<sup>65</sup> Of all these writers Bankim Chandra Chatterjee exercised the greatest influence in India and his works bewailed the loss of independence in the heart-rending manner and stirred up the imagination of the people and made them devotees to the cause of the nation. Bipin Chandra Pal<sup>66</sup> called him the *prophet of Indian cultural renaissance* and Aurobindo Ghosh regarded him as one of the "*Makers of Modern India*."<sup>67</sup> What Bankim Chandra was for Bengali, Bhartendu Harish Chandra was for Hindi literature. Speaking in disgust and in a patriots tone his works, *Bharat Durdasha*; *Bharat Janani*; and *Andher Nagari* made the people conscious of their miserable condition under British Rule<sup>68</sup> and instilled political consciousness among the Hindi speaking people. Thus, a band of scholars, writers and poets through their works facilitated the growth of Indian Nationalism.

Political awakening in India was not an isolated event. It bore the impact of similar movements of the world. "India's awakening," Tagore rightly observed, "is part of the world awakening."<sup>69</sup> In Europe it was in the 19th century that Germany and Italy attained national unification. In England this century witnessed the movement for parliamentary reforms. All these exercised a healthy influence upon the minds of Indians and invigorated in the Indian people a spirit to ask for the reforms that were taking place in England. The demand for representative government in India assumed more and more vigorous form under the influence of the Young Turk Movement, the victory of Japan in the Russo-Japanese War, the introduction of representative institutions in colonies like New South Wales, *New Zeland*, New Foundland, Barbadoes and in the Philippines, the Chinese Revolution of 1911, the rise of Sinn Fein Movement in Ireland and the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917.<sup>70</sup>

However, all the political, economic and racial grievances of the Indian people and the Western contact could not have produced a truly Indian National Movement, if there had not been at the same time a genuine urge from within, a spirit of renaissance aiming at the redemption of her people from the crushing load of unreason, social abuses and political servitude.<sup>71</sup> The religious and social awakening in the 19th century prepared the base for the national movement in India. Referring to India's new awakening C.F. Andrews very aptly remarked : "This awakening would have been wholly insufficient to usher in a new era if it had not been combined with a second and even greater change. A religious reformation has been advancing side by side with the new renaissance"<sup>72</sup> Various reform movements transformed the very character of the national life and the spiritual idealism accompanying these reform movements became a potent factor in fostering the forces of nationalism.

Era of social and religious reforms started with Ram Mohan Roy who fought vigorously against the corrupt practices, the superstitions and inhuman customs of the Hindu society and against the narrow parochial outlook of Indian mind. Behind his religious and social reform activities was his desire to regenerate political consciousness in India.<sup>73</sup> Though the Raja welcomed the British Rule, he fought like a lion to increase the political liberties of the Indian and to liberalise the British Rule.<sup>74</sup> Debendra Nath Tagore and Keshab Chandra upon whom fell the leadership of the Brahmo Samaj after Ram Mohan Roy thought that the salvation of India lay in the religious upliftment of the people. Though a religious and social reformer Keshab Chandra Sen seemed to be burning with an intense patriotism and urged the people to arise from the stupor and assured them that the *blessed morning of your redemption* had come.<sup>75</sup> Keshab Chandra carried the message of *Brahmo Samaj* all over India. His visit to England also stimulated political consciousness among the Indian people. The political movement inaugurated by Ananda Mohan Basu and Surendra Nath Banerjee through the Indian Association owed its psychological origin to the ideal of freedom emphasised in the *Brahmo Samaj* and the new national self-confidence and self-consciousness quickened by visit of Keshab Chandra to England.<sup>76</sup> In short, the *Brahmo Samaj* through its activities in social and religious fields prepared the ground for national awakening.

Dayananda founded the *Arya Samaj* in 1875 and held the superfluous rituals sponsored by Brahmin priests responsible for the degradation of the Hindu Society and regarded the *Vedas* as timeless and divine in origin<sup>77</sup> and warned the Indians not to be mere imitators of European modes of thought.<sup>78</sup> By claiming the *Vedas* containing the highest religious truth, he<sup>79</sup> injected into the dormant soul of millions of India the sense of self-respect. Moreover, Dayananda stressed the need of indigenous rule.<sup>80</sup> Har Bilas Sarda, the biographer of Dayananda, maintained, "Political independence was one of the first objectives of Dayananda."<sup>81</sup> B C. Pal also pointed out that the movement of Dayananda, as organised in the *Arya Samaj*, contributed more than the *Brahmo Samaj* to the birth of national consciousness in India.<sup>82</sup>

Ram Krishna stimulated the growth of national consciousness among the people by proclaiming the superiority of Indian culture<sup>83</sup> and in doing so he gave the rising nationalist, 'consciousness,' a weapon with which to fight the West.<sup>84</sup> Ram Krishna's disciple Vivekananda declared the religious superiority of the Hindus,

opposed the social Europeanisation of the Indians and taught self-respect and inspired his countrymen to accept their own traditional culture and values.<sup>85</sup> By his speeches and activities he stimulated the pride of the Indians in their own culture and religion and strengthened the spirit of political nationalism. R.G. Pradhan rightly observed, "Swami Vivekananda might well be called the father of modern Indian nationalism, he largely created it and also embodied in his own life its highest and noblest elements."<sup>86</sup>

The Theosophist movement strengthened the pride of Hindus in their ancient civilisation and declared that the religious and moral principles inculcated by Hinduism were not inferior to those of any other religion.<sup>87</sup> This new message coming from the representatives of the most advanced people of the world raised Indians in their own estimation and created self-confidence among the Indians.<sup>88</sup> Valentine Chirol blamed Annie Besant for encouraging unrest in India.<sup>89</sup>

Closely allied with religious reform movement was the social reform movement which opposed various social abuses and helped the cause of Indian nationalism. Reformers like Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chandra, Dadoba Pandurang, Kishori Chandra Mitra, M.G. Ranade, R.G. Bhandarkar, M. Malabari, N.G. Chandavarkar, K.T. Telang, Viswanath Narayan Mandalik, Gopal Hari Deshmukh, Viresalingam Pantulu, Jotiba Govind Phule and several others awakened the people to the ills of the society and stimulated ethos and vigour in society which helped to foster national spirit.<sup>90</sup>

Surendra Nath Banerjee rightly stated that in the evolution of political progress bad rulers are often a blessing in disguise.<sup>91</sup> The repressive policy of Lord Lytton's regime (1876-80) accelerated the pace of the nationalist movement. When the country was facing a gigantic famine Lord Lytton held Imperial *Durbar* in 1877.

Abolition of cotton import duty in the interest of Manchester, the lowering of the age limit for entrance to the Civil Services Examination from 21 to 19, the Vernacular Press Act, the Indian Arms Act, the large increase in the army under the hallucination of the Russian invasion, the wanton invasion of Kabul and the Second Afghan War made the people totally against the British regime. Under Lytton "the cup of national endurance and patience seemed almost full," and his "incapacity to realise the conditions of the country, his reckless desire to glorify his rule and his apparent want of any higher principles all but wrecked the British Dominion in the East."<sup>92</sup> The state of things at the end of Lord Lytton's regime was bordering upon revolution.<sup>93</sup>

The shrewd British Government sent after Lytton, a liberal Viceroy, Lord Ripon, who repealed the Vernacular Press Act. To remove racial distinction in the sphere of justice and to amend the Criminal Procedure Code, Ilbert Bill, which aimed at investing the Indian Judges powers to try Europeans also, was introduced in the Imperial Legislative Council in February, 1883. Europeans living in India vehemently opposed the Bill and an Anglo-Indian and European Defence League was immediately formed to carry on the agitation against the Bill.<sup>94</sup>

Protest meetings were held all over the country.<sup>95</sup> Under the pressure of the agitation the Bill was revised in such a way that the very purpose of the Bill was defeated. But the Ilbert Bill exposed Europeans's contempt for Indians and taught the Indians the value of organisation. The Ilbert Bill agitation was a landmark in

the history of Indian political consciousness in the sense that it strengthened the forces that were speeding up the birth of Congress movement.<sup>96</sup>

All these forces prepared the ground for national awakening and strengthened the desire of the Indians to organise an all India political organisation. The Indian National Congress, which was the greatest political organisation to carry on the nationalist struggle, was established in 1885. But even before the birth of the Indian National Congress, some associations had sprung up to promote national interests. The first organisation formed for political purposes was the Zamindary Association of Bengal founded in 1837 which changed its name to the Landholders Society which taught the Indians "to assert their claims and give expression to their opinions".<sup>97</sup>

Another political organisation during the pre-mutiny era was the British India Society established in April 1843, which failed to rouse political consciousness even amongst the limited circle of educated men in Bengal.<sup>98</sup> "The first political body to adopt an All India outlook"<sup>99</sup> was the British Indian Association formed in October 1851. The object of the new association was to secure improvements in the local administration of the country and in the system of government laid down by Parliament.<sup>100</sup> Branches of the association were opened in Oudh, Madras and Bombay. After mutiny the association ceased to represent the political ambitions of the Indian people.<sup>101</sup> However, by 1870 it was "the only political body in the whole of India respected by government",<sup>102</sup> Sisir Kumar Ghosh, the leading Bengali of the 19th century, established the India League to stimulate nationalism among the people and to encourage political education.<sup>103</sup> It was the first political body in India to seek more than casual ties with political groups outside its own province, and thus, it antedated Surendra Nath Banerjee's Indian Association, in this all India purpose,<sup>104</sup> it was the first marked sign of the awakening of the people on this side of India to political life.<sup>105</sup>

In 1875 the Indian Association was established by Surendra Nath Banerjee who defined the objects of the association as the creation of a strong body of public opinion in the country, the unification of the Indian races and people upon the basis of common political interests and aspirations and the inclusion of the masses in the great public movements of the day.<sup>106</sup> The association protested against the age limit for the Indian Civil Services, and launched a massive agitation against the repressive policies of the Government. The Indian association summoned the First National Conference in Calcutta in December, 1883. Both Hindus and Muslims attended the conference. As a matter of fact, the Calcutta conference anticipated the Congress by two years and in a large measure prepared the ground for the great national assembly.<sup>107</sup> The Second session of the National Conference held in Calcutta in 1885 discussed most of the urgent problems of India and sent a telegram to the conference of the Congress to be held at Bombay expressing their sympathy with the approaching conference in Bombay.<sup>108</sup>

Needless to say that Bengal took the lead in establishing political associations but the other provinces did not lag behind. The Bombay Association was formed in Bombay Presidency in the year 1852 which shortly became practically extinct.<sup>109</sup> A branch of the East India Association of London was opened at Bombay in 1871 but by 1883 it proved a decided failure.<sup>110</sup> As a result of the efforts of Pheroz Shah Mehta, Badruddin Tyabji and K.T. Telang and Bombay Presidency Association was

organised in 1885. This association concerned itself with all matters of common interest.<sup>111</sup> In 1870, Poona established the *Poona Sarvajanic Sabha* which led to a new awakening in Maharashtra.<sup>112</sup>

In South India, public life was inaugurated by the Hindu.<sup>113</sup> The most organised political association in the South was Madras Mahajan Sabha which enlisted the active sympathy and co-operation of almost all the culture and public spirit of the Presidency.<sup>114</sup>

All these developments bore testimonies to the fact that the educated Indians sincerely felt the need of an All Indian Association. Their concerted attempts were crowned with success in 1885 when the Indian National Congress was formed.

But it had been one of the enigmas of history as to who originated this idea of an All India Congress. Pattabhi Sitaramayya has discussed the Genesis of the Indian National Congress in the following words: "Apart from the *Great Durbar* of 1877 or the *International Exhibition* in Calcutta which are supposed to have furnished the model for the great national assemblage, it is also said that the idea was conceived in a private meeting of seventeen men after the theosophical convention held at Madras in December, 1884. . . . Whatever the origin and whoever the originator of the idea, we come to this conclusion, that the idea was in the air, that the need of such organisation was being felt, that Mr. Allan Octavian Hume took the initiative".<sup>115</sup> Malabari<sup>116</sup> and G. S. Iyer<sup>117</sup> traced the origin of the Congress to the demonstrations in 1884 to mark Ripon's departure from India. Dr. Nandlal Chatterjee has suggested that the British helped the formation of such a body to rally Indian public opinion against the apprehended Russian menace.<sup>118</sup> B. L. Grover also maintained that *Russophobia* compelled the British to devise means for mustering the support of the Indian people in the event of the Russian invasion of India.<sup>119</sup>

Whatever might have been the reasons for the creation of the Congress and whatever might have been the genesis of this great political association, the Indian National Congress was the culmination of the evolution of the political ideas and associations that existed before its birth. However, the history of the genesis of the Congress would remain incomplete without reference to the role played by A. O. Hume in the formation of the Congress. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, in a statement in London in 1913, declared that it was the commanding personality of Hume that made the Congress possible in India.<sup>120</sup> Hume, who has the wisdom to understand that the broadest dissemination of Western education and Western ideas of liberty had let loose forces in India which needed control and direction into channels through which they might flow, not to ravage and destroy but to fertilise and regenerate, took the initiative in the foundation of the Indian National Congress.<sup>121</sup> He found that economic and political unrests were becoming more and more vehement in India and opposition to the British rule was increasing day in and day out. To "counteract the growing unrest"<sup>122</sup> and to keep the growing unrest under reasonable bounds Hume thought that some definite action was needed. He addressed an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University on March 1, 1883 and urged them to establish an association with an object to promote the mental, moral, spiritual, political and social regeneration of the people of India.<sup>123</sup>

This appeal had a remarkable effect on the Indian people and by the end of

1884 the Indian National Union was formed. Hume wanted that the Union should concentrate on social question and consulted Dufferin, the then Viceroy of India, who advised Hume that his scheme would not do much service to the people if it concentrated only on social problems. Dufferin said that there was no association in India which performed the functions which the opposition did in England. Hence it would be very desirable in the interests of both the ruler and the ruled, Dufferin urged, that Indian politicians should meet yearly and point out to the Government in what respects the administration was defective and how it could be improved. He further suggested that an assembly, such as he proposed, should not be presided over by the Local Governor as Hume had proposed, because in the presence of the Governor the people might not like to speak out their minds. Dufferin had made it a condition with Hume that his name in connection with the scheme of the Congress should not be divulged so long as he remained in India. Hume put Dufferin's proposals before leading politicians in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and other parts of the country who adopted Dufferin's scheme and proceeded to give effect to it.<sup>121</sup> S.K. Ratcliffe subscribed to the views of Wedderburn and wrote: "Lord Dufferin's attitude at this time was interesting and revealing. Not only did he welcome the Congress, but it was he who, when Hume told him of his intention to begin reform agitation on the social side of Indian life, advised him to widen its scope and aim definitely at political education".<sup>125</sup> Blessed or not by Dufferin, Hume proposed for the formation of the Congress which was to serve the purpose of "a safety-valve" and "an overt and constitutional channel" for the discharge of Indian ferment.<sup>126</sup>

The Indian National Union, formed by Hume in 1884, decided in March, 1885 to hold a conference at Poona in the last week of December 1885 and issued a circular letter for this. As Cholera broke out in Poona the venue of the conference was shifted to Bombay and its name was changed into Indian National Congress. The first session of the Congress began on December 25, 1885 and was presided over by W.C. Banerjee. In his presidential address W.C. Banerjee laid down the objects of the Congress which included the promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst the workers in Country's cause throughout the various parts of the Empire; the eradication by direct intercourse at all possible race, creed or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of the country and the fuller development and consolidation of the sentiments of national unity.<sup>127</sup> About 72 delegates from different parts of India attended the conference.<sup>128</sup> The first session of the Congress held at Bombay appeared more or less like a drawing room gathering.<sup>129</sup> But as the years rolled by the Congress became a giant organisation and its popularity increased to such an extent that an English correspondent wrote in 1889 that the Congress had become a factor in the affairs of India and England that has to be reckoned with.<sup>130</sup>

The Indian National Congress, in its early years, did not aim at complete severance of India's connection with England. "Unswerving loyalty to the British Crown", wrote by Wedderburn, was to be the key-note of the institution,<sup>131</sup> and the aim of the Congress was to educate the Indian people into a genuine parliamentary frame of mind.<sup>132</sup> The early Congressmen merely wanted to liberalise the British Rule and to get certain political and constitutional reforms. It would seem surprising

that the Congress, which fought for the freedom of the nation, in its early years, was an association which aimed at political and constitutional concessions and was loyal to the British *Raj*, when, in his presidential address to the Congress in 1886, Dadabhai Naoroji put the question "Is this Congress a nursery of sedition and rebellion against the British Government"? the delegates cried "*no, no*"; when, continuing he asked, "or is it another stone in the foundation of the stability of that Government"? the answer was "*yes, yes*".<sup>133</sup>

In the beginning the official attitude towards the Congress was friendly. Lord Dufferin in 1886 and Lord Connemara in 1887 invited the members of the second and third sessions of the Congress held respectively at Calcutta and Madras, as distinguished visitors to garden parties of the Government house.<sup>134</sup> Even the early Congressmen claimed that the Congress was the result of the existence of the British influence in the country.<sup>135</sup> But this cordial relation between the Government and the Congress could not last long and it was replaced by a relation of mutual distrust and antagonism. H. Whitehead recorded that most Englishmen in India were, from the very beginning, hostile to the Congress and in the early years of the Congress *all talks of self-government in India was regarded by the majority of the British as disloyal*.<sup>136</sup> Even Lord Dufferin, who was supposed to be in favour of the formation of the Congress, in his speech at St. Andrews Day Dinner in Calcutta on November 30, 1888 termed the Congress as a "microscopic minority" and ridiculed the Congress's demand for the introduction of democratic methods of government in India.<sup>137</sup> The Government of India in 1890 prevented the government officials from attending the meetings of the Congress.<sup>138</sup> Seeing the growing popularity of the Congress in India, Hamilton wrote to Curzon in May 1899 suggesting means to counteract the activities of the Congress.<sup>139</sup> Lord Curzon came to India as Viceroy in 1899 to assist it (Congress) to a peaceful demise.<sup>140</sup>

The Indian National Congress was a symbol of India's urge for freedom. Nevertheless, the statement of the official historian of the Congress that "the History of the Congress is really the history of India's struggle for freedom"<sup>141</sup> could not be accepted as a balanced judgment on the achievements of this great organisation. It would be historically inaccurate to say that the Congress was the only body that symbolised the freedom struggle, for there were other forces at work. It would again be historically inaccurate to say that Indian nationalism was a single or unified movement with local manifestations which were related to an overall conception making for the unity or homogeneity. India, in fact, experienced many nationalisms as many as there were generally accepted ideas of the nation. As developments in the 20th century proved some of those nationalisms "worked in opposition to others".<sup>142</sup> In other words, side-by-side the nationalism of the Congress flourished another nationalism known as Muslim nationalism which at times co-operated with the former and at times was opposed to it.

A host of factors played part in giving a separate identity to the national aspirations of the Muslims in India. In the 19th century the Muslims had developed little political consciousness in comparison to their Hindu fellows because they lacked both the necessary education and the contacts.<sup>143</sup> As against the Hindus, the Muslims did not take the English education with enthusiasm and were averse to the secular education which resulted in their backwardness as compared to Hindus.

In 1865-66 the Muslims formed only three and a half per cent of the total enrolment of colleges.<sup>144</sup> The proportion of Muslims to Hindus in gazetted appointments since 1880 was one-tenth.<sup>145</sup>

During the first-half of the 19th century the attitude of the Muslims towards the British was hostile and the Wahabbi movement and the Mutiny of 1857-58 convinced the government that the Muslims were inimical to the British *Raj*.<sup>146</sup> The British were so distrustful of the Muslims that all over the North-western Provinces a Mohammedan was another word for a rebel.<sup>147</sup>

But soon the tables turned and the policy of hostility gave way to the policy of reconciliation. In bringing the Muslims near to the British Government and in weaning the government from its policy of suppression to one of paternalism and in creating a new awakening among the Muslims W.W. Hunter and Sir Syed Ahmed Khan played the significant role. W.W. Hunter in his famous book entitled *Indian Mussalmans* pointed out that the anti-Muslim policy of the government had alienated the Indian Muslims who were simmering with anti-British feeling and pleaded for a more lenient attitude towards the Muslims to make them loyal to the British *Raj*.<sup>148</sup> Another man who awakened the Muslims to Western learning and who infused vigour in the Muslim Community was Sir Syed Ahmed Khan.<sup>149</sup> Even before the arrival of Sir Syed on the political firmament of India, the Muslims had established their own associations to further the cause of the Muslim Community. The first political association, which the Muslims established, was the Mohammedan Association of 1856.<sup>150</sup> In 1863 the Mohammedan Literary and Scientific Society of Calcutta was established by Abdul Latif. The Society aimed at persuading the Muslims to study the English language to help them in securing a substantial share in Government services.<sup>151</sup> It had about 200 members<sup>152</sup> by 1865 and it rendered valuable services in spreading among the Muslims the study of English.<sup>153</sup> Calcutta saw the birth of a new association, namely, National Mohammedan Association in 1878 with Syed Amir Ali as the Secretary. The association was formed with the object of promoting the well-being of the Mussalmans of India,<sup>154</sup> by all legitimate and constitutional means. The association had 54 branches spreading all over India in 1888.<sup>155</sup> Significant feature of the association was that Hindu leaders like Surendra Nath Banerjee, Ramesh Chandra Mitter, W.C. Banerjee, were the Honorary members of the association.<sup>156</sup> The association asked for a proportion of jobs to be reserved for the Muslims,<sup>157</sup> and co-operated with other leaders on the question of the Ilbert Bill. Amir Ali joined the Hindu members in the Imperial Legislative Council to support the Ilbert Bill.<sup>158</sup>

The Central Mohammedan Association did not like the Congress attitude of uneasiness towards the Government,<sup>159</sup> and became hostile to the programme of the Congress for representative institutions which they thought, would lead to the political extinction of the Mohammedans.<sup>160</sup> Amir Ali and Abdul Latif refused to take part in the Congress session held at Calcutta in 1886.<sup>161</sup>

The greatest movement to awaken political consciousness among the Muslims was the Aligarh Movement of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Throughout his life Sir Syed urged his co-religionists to keep faith in the British *Raj* and to keep in touch with Western education.<sup>162</sup> He further told his co-religionists that unless they assimilate European Arts and Sciences they would remain in wretched state.<sup>163</sup> His attempts

for the regeneration of his Community bore fruit in the establishment of the M.A.O. College at Aligarh which became the centre of a great educational, social and cultural movement among the Muslims in India.<sup>164</sup> To promote Western learning in the Muslims Sir Syed formed the Translation Society which was to translate scientific and historical works from English into Urdu.<sup>165</sup>

Sir Syed was not a separatist in the early years of his life. On several occasions he had stressed Hindu-Muslim unity and had described India as a beautiful bird whose two eyes were Hindus and Muslims provided the two eyes shone with equal lustre.<sup>166</sup> On January 2, 1884, Sir Syed addressed an audience at Gurdaspur :

“Remember that the words Hindu and Mohammedan are only meant for religious distinction otherwise all persons, whether Hindu or Mohammedan or even Christian, who reside in this country, are all in this particular respect belonging to one and the same nation”.<sup>167</sup>

Soon after Sir Syed changed his attitude and the man who had once preached the gospel of one and united India began to propagate that India was not a single nation and that Hindus and Muslims constituted two nations.<sup>168</sup> Numerous factors were responsible for this trend of thinking in the Muslim Community of India. Growth of Muslim separatism was facilitated by the British Government's policy to *divide and rule* and to placate the Muslims. Sir John Strachey<sup>169</sup> and Lt. John Coke<sup>170</sup> asked the British that their endeavours in India should be to uphold in full force the separation which existed between the different religions and races and should not forget the maxim of *Divide et impera* in governing a big country like India. Beck and Morison, the two British principals of the Aligarh College were “the architects of Muslim separatism”.<sup>171</sup> Beck made a systematic effort to alienate the Muslims from the Hindus and asked the Muslims to dissociate themselves from the Congress which was the instigator of “a mutiny”.<sup>172</sup> Thus, official and non-official influences compelled the Muslims to see in the Congress a seditious movement aiming at the introduction of a “*Hindu Raj*” fatal to the interests of the whole community.<sup>173</sup>

The schism between the Hindus and Muslims had been traced to the aggressiveness and religious revival activities of the Hindus.<sup>174</sup> The Hindu revivalist movement, which was more anti-Muslim than anti-British to Khalid B. Sayeed<sup>175</sup> produced a wave of suspicion and unrest in the minds of the Muslims in India. Moreover, the Muslims in India under Pan-Islamic influences began to evince keen interest in the Muslim Countries of the World which, in turn, gave birth to the feeling that Muslims outside India were more allied to them than their Hindu neighbours.<sup>176</sup> The unfortunate controversy over Hindi *Versus* Urdu embittered the relationship between the Hindus and Muslims. The Hindus of Benaras started a movement in 1867 to replace Urdu by Hindi and the Arabic Script by Nagari which enraged the Muslims. As early as 1867 Sir Syed told Mr. Shakespeare, the Divisional Commissioner of Benaras, “Now I am convinced that the two Communities will not be able to co-operate sincerely in any matter. It is only the beginning. He who lives will see”.<sup>177</sup> Thus, a number of factors helped the growth of Muslim separatism and towards the close of the 19th century, Muslims started to look upon themselves as composing one nation, distinct from other Indians.

Considering the Muslims as a separate nation, Sir Syed asked his followers to

keep aloof from the Congress which according to Sir Syed's adviser, Beck, was becoming a *deadly engine of sedition*.<sup>178</sup> Sir Syed developed a phobia of tyranny of the majority over the minority. The Congress in its very first session had demanded the reconstitution of Legislative Council on representative basis to a certain extent. Sir Syed opposed this demand on the ground that the representative institutions would only increase the predominance of the Hindus in the legislatures. He further argued that India was not fit for representative institutions as she was *peopled with different nations*.<sup>179</sup> He characterised the proposals of the Congress as *monstrous and unreasonable*.<sup>180</sup> He told his co-religionists that the object of the promoters of the National Congress is that Government of India should be English in name only, and that the internal rule of the country should be entirely in their own hands.<sup>181</sup> Sir Syed, who hoped to create Anglo-Muslim Entente, became furious when he saw Muslims taking active part in the Congress. He led a crusade against the Congress by laying the foundation of the Annual Muslim Educational Conference in 1886 which held simultaneous sittings with the Congress in 1887.<sup>182</sup> He told his co-religionists, "If you accept that the country should groan under the Bengali rule and its people lick the Bengali shoes, then in the name of God jump into the train, 'sit-down and be off to Madras, be off to Madras',<sup>183</sup> where the third session of the Congress was to be held". Badruddin Tyabji who presided over the Congress session at Madras was also approached by Sir Syed and Amir Ali not to preside over the Congress but Tyabji refused to accept the suggestion and wrote to Amir Ali that for Muslims "the proper course is to join the Congress".<sup>184</sup> Tyabji expressed surprise over the attitude of these Muslim leaders and wrote: "It does seem to me to be a great pity that on matter affecting India as a whole any section of the Mussalman Community should keep aloof from the Hindus and thus retard the national progress of India as a whole."<sup>185</sup> But Sir Syed, who was a little insane on the subject of the Congress,<sup>186</sup> with the assistance of Principal Beck and Raja Shiva Prasad, founded the Indian United Patriotic Association in 1888<sup>187</sup> as a counterblast to the Congress.<sup>188</sup> The aim of the association was to show that the whole of India was not with the Congress.<sup>189</sup> The association enjoyed the sympathy of the fifty-two Muslim organisations spread all over India. Some of these organisations even passed rules to expel those Muslims from their rank who either belonged to the Congress or were in any way sympathetic to its aspirations.<sup>190</sup>

The United Patriotic Association, which Sir Syed had established to work as a bulwark against the Congress and to dislodge the Congress session proposed to be held at Allahabad in 1888, failed to accomplish the desired task<sup>191</sup> and the number of delegates rose to 1348 including 222 Muslims at the Allahabad session.<sup>192</sup> Nevertheless Sir Syed and his followers continued their crusade against the Congress and to clog the Congress movement he convened a meeting at Aligarh on December 30, 1893 and with Beck's support established the Mohammedan Anglo Oriental Defence Association of Upper India which was to be an organisation having only Muslims and Britons as members. The main objects of this new association were to protect the political rights of the Muslims, keep them away from political agitation and to help measures that would strengthen British Rule in India.<sup>193</sup> But even this association could not succeed in preventing the Muslims from joining the Congress. With Sir Syed's death in 1898 and Beck's death in 1899 the Association *the sickly child of*

*Sir Syed's old age* . . . . expired in 1900 but the seed of communalism which had been sown was to sprout six years later in the form of the Muslim League.<sup>194</sup>

The supporters of Congress and the Hindu Press attacked Sir Syed for his anti-Congress attitude. Henry Cotton held that Sir Syed had an acute sense of political opportunism and he was opposed to Congress because he was made a K.C.S.I.<sup>195</sup> The *Indian Mirror* called Sir Syed "a tool in the hands of our enemies"<sup>196</sup> Lala Lajpat Rai in his series of open letters to Sir Syed attributed Syed's hostility to the Congress as his *Official Khusamad*.<sup>197</sup>

Beyond doubt, Sir Syed succeeded in persuading the bulk of Muslims to stay aloof from the Congress. But it would be wrong to associate with the observation that after Syed's lectures at Lucknow and Meerut on December 28, 1887 and March 16, 1888 respectively no Mussalman of note joined the Congress except one or two.<sup>198</sup> Hafiz Malik was not accurate in saying that R.M. Sayani and Badruddin Tyabji failed to persuade their co-religionists to join the Congress.<sup>199</sup>

It would be incorrect to say that Muslims, as a body, were opposed to the Congress. In the Congress of 1886 there were 33 Muslim delegates.<sup>200</sup> In spite of the constant efforts to prevent Muslims from joining Congress, 79 Muslim delegates attended the Madras session in 1887.<sup>201</sup> The number of Muslim delegates rose to 222 at Allahabad session of the Congress in 1888, and to 254 at the Bombay session in 1889.<sup>202</sup> But the Hindu-Muslim riots that occurred in the various parts of India increased the gulf between the two communities and the Congress had to take steps to persuade the Muslims to join the Congress. Only 65 Muslim delegates attended the Congress session in 1893 and many of them claimed exemption from the payment of delegation fee as well as the messing charge on the plea that they were religious preachers.<sup>203</sup> The position at the eleventh session of the Congress held at Poona in 1895 did not improve and there were only 19 Muslims out of 1584 delegates.<sup>204</sup>

To impress upon the Muslims that the Congress was a non-communal association and the muster Muslim support for the Congress movement, the Congress leaders invited R.M. Sayani to preside over the twelfth session of the Congress held at Calcutta in 1896. In his presidential address he refuted the allegation that the Congress wanted to substitute Hindu for British rule and urged the Muslims to discard the policy of keeping aloof from the Congress, which was the only national body.<sup>205</sup> Sayani's appeal did not produce favourable result and the Moslem Chronicle accused Sayani of being *their Master's Voice*.<sup>206</sup> Nevertheless, 311 Muslim delegates attended the Congress session at Lucknow in 1899 and formed 42 per cent of the total delegates.<sup>207</sup> But after 1899 the representation of Muslim delegates at Congress sessions began to fall by big margin. In 1900 only 56 Muslims attended the Lahore session of the Congress. In 1901 this number rose to 74, in 1903 the numbers came to 9 and in 1905 only 20 Muslim delegates attended the Congress session held at Benaras.<sup>208</sup>

Thus, by the end of the 19th century two nationalisms were working in India. One was Congress nationalism and the other was Muslim nationalism, although the former enjoyed the support of the Muslims. On the whole, the prevalent attitude of the Muslims towards the Congress was not encouraging. Leaders like Surendra Nath Banerjee and Gopal Krishna Gokhale regretted the attitude of the Muslims towards

the Congress. Surendra Nath Banerjee wrote : "The Mohammedan community, under the leadership of Sir Syed Ahmed, had held aloof from the Congress. They were working under the auspices of the Patriotic Association in opposition to the National Movement."<sup>9</sup> Gokhale's regret was fully admitted : "Seventy millions of Mohammedans were more or less hostile to national aspirations."<sup>10</sup> In short, towards the end of the 19th century Muslims were beginning to look upon themselves as composing one nation distinct from other Indians.

The All India Muslim League was established in 1906, which became the centre of Muslim activities and which, more or less, monopolised the Muslim allegiance. Nevertheless, Congress nationalism usually characterised as Indian Nationalism still enjoyed the support of the Muslims. The Muslims belonging to the tradition of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and to the umbrella of the Muslim League had different modes of working out their salvation. Both aimed at the independence of the country, though they differed from one another on so many important issues. However, at times the two nationalisms co-operated together and before 1940 they had the similar objectives with some minor differences, and, more or less, the political ideas of Indian Muslims were identical with the rest of the Indians. Even after 1940, the year in which the Muslim League Session of Lahore demanded the separate homeland for the Muslims by passing the "*Pakistan Resolution*", the Muslim League and the Congress were found working together. Moreover, the Muslim League joined the Interim Government formed by Jawaharlal Nehru in 1946. But the ultimate result was the vivisection of the nation and the birth of Pakistan in August 1947 when India became independent. However, the partition of India and the birth of Pakistan was merely an accident of History. Hence, the discussion of Indian Nationalism would remain incomplete without the discussion about the Muslim League. And it would be also wrong to say that the Congress Nationalism alone symbolised Indian Nationalism. Moreover, Indian Nationalism, which was not a unified movement, should always be the narrative of the Congress and the League Movements, which at times co-operated with one another forgetting their differences.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>L.S.O. Malley, *The Indian Civil Service*, (1931) pp. 220-21.
- <sup>2</sup>Sir John Strachey, *India*, (London, 1911), p. 360.
- <sup>3</sup>Maine to Dufferin, June 2, 1888, *Dufferin Papers* 38 (Reel 525).
- <sup>4</sup>Lytton to Sir E. Perry, April 18, 1877, *Lytton Papers* 518/2.
- <sup>5</sup>Hume to Ripon, March 14, 1884, *Ripon Papers*, Add. MSS. 43616.
- <sup>6</sup>Bernard Houghton, *The Revolt of the East*, (1921) pp. 1-2
- <sup>7</sup>Hamilton to Curzon, October 20, 1899, *Curzon Papers*, MSS. Eur. F. III/158 No. 54.
- <sup>8</sup>Morley, "British Democracy and Indian Government" *Nineteenth Century and After*, February 1911, pp. 189-200.
- <sup>9</sup>Lewis Pelly (ed) *The Views and Opinion of Brigadier General John Jacob*, (1858) p. 2.
- <sup>10</sup>Harriet Martineau, *Suggestions Towards the Future Government of India*, (1858), pp. 12-17.
- <sup>11</sup>See, E.M. Forester, *A. Passage to India*, (1924) pp. 50 51, and G.O. Trevelyan, *Cawnpore* (1910) p. 36.
- <sup>12</sup>John Beams, *Memoirs of a Bengal Civilian* (1961), p. 132.
- <sup>13</sup>Francis G. Hutchins, *The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India* 1967) p. 118.
- <sup>14</sup>William H. Russell, *My Diary in India in the year 1858-59* Vol. II (1860) p. 118.
- <sup>15</sup>Charles Dilke, *Greater Britain*, (1869) pp. 437-517.
- <sup>16</sup>Henry Cotton, *New India or India in Transition* (2nd ed. 1886) pp. 30-45.
- <sup>17</sup>Instruction, issued by Governor General Mayo (1869-72) to the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab cited in S. Gopal, *British Policy in India 1858-1905*, (1965) p. 121.
- <sup>18</sup>Sitaram, *From sepoy to subedar, Being the life and Adventures of a Native Officer of the Bengal Army written and Related by Himself* (1911) p. 311.
- <sup>19</sup>*Report of the Second Indian National Congress held at Calcutta* December, 1886 p. 106.
- <sup>20</sup>B.B. Majumdar, *History of Indian Social and Political Ideas : from Ram Mohan to Dayananda*, (1967) p. 199.
- <sup>21</sup>S.A. Wolpert, *Tilak and Gokhale, Revolution and Reform in the Making of the Modern India* 1952) p. 297.
- <sup>22</sup>Seely, *The Expansion of England* (1883) pp. 226-28
- <sup>23</sup>Sir John Strachey, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-5
- <sup>24</sup>*Congress Presidential Addresses, First Series, From the Foundation to the Silver Jubilee, 1885-1911*, (1935) pp. 6-7.
- <sup>25</sup>Debendra Nath Tagore, *Autobiography of Maharishi Debendra Nath Tagore*, (1914), p. 99.
- <sup>26</sup>N.G. Chandavarkar, *The Speeches and Writings of Sir Narayan. G. Chandavarkar* (1911) pp. 43-45.
- <sup>27</sup>Lala Lajpat Rai, *The Arya Samaj* (1932) p. 247.
- <sup>28</sup>Fred B. Fisher, *India's Silent Revolution*, p. 85.
- <sup>29</sup>Speech of V.G. Kale in the *Report of the 13th Indian National Congress held at Bombay in December, 1915* (1916), p. 112.
- <sup>30</sup>Speech of Padam Raj Jain, in the *Report of the Thirty-Three Indian National Congress held at Delhi in 1918* (Delhi, Reception Committee, 1919) pp. 128-29.
- <sup>31</sup>G.K. Gokhale, *Speeches of the Honourable G K. Gokhale*, (1st ed). p. 182.
- <sup>32</sup>*Report of the First Indian National Congress held in 1885*, p. 26.
- <sup>33</sup>Dadabhai Naoroji, *Speeches and Writings* (n.d.) p. 223
- <sup>34</sup>G.P. Pradhan and A.K. Bhagwat, *Lokamanya Tilak* (1958) p. 72
- <sup>35</sup>G.S. Iyer, *Some Economic Aspects of British Rule in India*, (1903) p. 9.
- <sup>36</sup>*New India*, Calcutta, August 12, 1902.
- <sup>37</sup>Naoroji, *Poverty and un-British Rule in India* (1901) p. 1.
- <sup>38</sup>R C. Dutt, *Economic History of India-Early British Rule*, (1901) p. 1.
- <sup>39</sup>*Congress Presidential Addresses First Series*, p. 693.
- <sup>40</sup>*Indu Prakash*, May 5, 1879.
- <sup>41</sup>J.C. Bagal, *History of Indian Association 1876-1951* (1952) p. 41.

- <sup>42</sup>C.L. Parekh, (ed) *Naoroji, Essays, Speeches and Writings* (1887) pp. 29-31.
- <sup>43</sup>R.C. Dutt, *Speeches and Papers on Indian Questions, 1901 and 1902* (1904) pp. 21-48
- <sup>44</sup>R.C. Dutt, *Economic History of India-Early British Rule* p. XIII
- <sup>45</sup>Cited in Bipin Chandra, *The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India* p. 504.
- <sup>46</sup>Naoroji. *Speeches and Writings*, op. cit p. 671.
- <sup>47</sup>G.V. Joshi, *Writings and Speeches*, (1912) p. 70.
- <sup>48</sup>*The Tribune*, January 5, 1887.
- <sup>49</sup>Cited in Anil Seal, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism* (1968) p.p. 133-34.
- <sup>50</sup>A Ramsay Mac Donald, *The Awakening of India* (1910) p. 124-25.
- <sup>51</sup>*Congress Presidential address*, First Series, p. 252.
- <sup>52</sup>*Report of the Thirteenth Indian National Congress, 1897*, p. 15.
- <sup>53</sup>Christine E. Dobbin (ed) *Basic Documents in the Development of Modern India and Pakistan 1835-1947* p. 25.
- <sup>54</sup>Henry Cotton, *New India or India in Transition*, p. 108.
- <sup>55</sup>Rabindra Nath Tagore, *Crisis in Civilisation*, p. 2
- <sup>56</sup>Quoted in B.N. Pandey, *The Break-up of British India* p. 23
- <sup>57</sup>R.C. Majumdar, *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. I p. 327.
- <sup>58</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (1956) p. 392.
- <sup>59</sup>*The Tribune*, December 18, 1887.
- <sup>60</sup>Alexander, J. Arbuthnot (ed) *Major-General Sir Thomas Munro--Selections from His Minutes and other Official Writings*. Vol. II (1881) p. 288.
- <sup>61</sup>T.E. Cole Brooke, *Life of the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone*, Vol. II (1884), p. 165.
- <sup>62</sup>Sisir Kumar Mitra, *Resurgent India*, p. 193.
- <sup>63</sup>*Ibid*, p. 154.
- <sup>64</sup>Bipin Chandra Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times*, Vol. I, (1932), p. 252.
- <sup>65</sup>K.K. Datta, *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, p. 5.
- <sup>66</sup>Bipin Chandra Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times*, Vol. I, P. 226.
- <sup>67</sup>Aurobindo Ghosh, *Bankim, Tilak, Dayananda* (1940) p. 9.
- <sup>68</sup>Ram Bilas Sharma, *Bhartendu Harish Chandra*, pp. 24 25.
- <sup>69</sup>Cited in Sisir Kumar Mitra, op. cit. p. 40.
- <sup>70</sup>R.C. Majumdar, *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. I, pp. 292.
- <sup>71</sup>K.K. Datta, op. cit., p. 2.
- <sup>72</sup>C.F. Andrews, *The Renaissance of India*, (1912), p. 11.
- <sup>73</sup>J.C. Gosh (ed), *The English Works of Ram Mohan Roy*, (1906) pp. 929-30.
- <sup>74</sup>Mary Carpenter, *The Last Days in England of Raja Ram Mohan Roy*, pp. 57-59.
- <sup>75</sup>Cited in Sisir Kumar Mitra, op. cit., p. 122.
- <sup>76</sup>*Ibid*, pp. 131-32.
- <sup>77</sup>Some Arya Samajists, *The Arya Samaj*, p. 21.
- <sup>78</sup>Lajpat Rai, *The Arya Samaj*, pp. 254-57.
- <sup>79</sup>Bawa Chhajju Singh, *The Teachings of the Arya Samaj* (1903), p. 102.
- <sup>80</sup>Suraj Bhan, *Dayananda; His Life and Work* (1956), p. 145-46.
- <sup>81</sup>Har Bilas Sarda, *Life of Dayanada Saraswati* (1946), p. Cxxii.
- <sup>82</sup>B.C. Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times* Vol. I. pp. 310-14.
- <sup>83</sup>Ram Krishan : *Prophet of New India* (abridged from "The Gospel of Sri Ram Krishna" and translated into English by Swami Nikhila Nanda, (1948), pp. 61-62.
- <sup>84</sup>Andrews and Mookerjee, *The Rise and Growth of Congress in India 1832-1920* p. 79.
- <sup>85</sup>*Vivekananda Centenary Volume* 1963, p. 523.
- <sup>86</sup>R.G. Pradhan, *India's Struggle for Swaraj* (1930), p. 60.
- <sup>87</sup>H.S. Olcott, *The Peril of Indian Youth* (1916), pp. 3-6.
- <sup>88</sup>B.C. Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times*, Vol. I, p. 425.
- <sup>89</sup>Valentine Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, (1910), pp. 28-29.
- <sup>90</sup>See Charles, H. Heimsath, *Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform* 1964.
- <sup>91</sup>Surendra Nath Banerjee, *A Nation in Making, Being the Reminiscences of Fifty Years of Public Life*, (1965). p. 63.
- <sup>92</sup>A.O. Hume, *The Star in the East, or the Bengal National League*, (1886), p. 6.

- <sup>93</sup>W.S. Bunt, *India under Ripon, A Private Diary*, (1909), p. 216.
- <sup>94</sup>Lucien Wolf, *Life of the First Marquess of Ripon*, Vol. 11, p. 128.
- <sup>95</sup>*The Times*, September 3, 1883, October 1, 1883, *Englishman*; May 2, 1883.
- <sup>96</sup>Surendra Nath Banerjee *A Nation in Making*, p. 86.
- <sup>97</sup>Jogeshwar Mitter (ed) *Raja Rajendralal Mitra's Speeches*, (1892), p. 25.
- <sup>98</sup>B.B. Majumdar, *Indian Political Associations and Reforms of Legislature 1818-1917*,
- <sup>99</sup>Andrews and Mookerjee, *op. cit.* p. 6, 1966, p. 30-32.
- <sup>100</sup>*Bengal Harkaru*, November 18, 1851.
- <sup>101</sup>Andrews and Mookerjee, *op. cit.* p. 62.
- <sup>102</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 10, 1870.
- <sup>103</sup>J. C. Bagal, *op. cit.* pp. 7-8.
- <sup>104</sup>Charles H. Hemisath, *op. cit.* p. 64.
- <sup>105</sup>*The Englishman*, cited in J.C. Bagal, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
- <sup>106</sup>Surendra Nath Banerjee, *A Nation in Making*, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-44.
- <sup>107</sup>A.C. Majumdar, *Indian National Evolution*, (1917), p. 40.
- <sup>108</sup>J.C. Bagal, *op. cit.* pp. 80-88.
- <sup>109</sup>A.C. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
- <sup>110</sup>*Indian Mirror*, February 17, 1883.
- <sup>111</sup>H.P. Mody, Sir, *Pheroz Shah Mehta*, Vol. I, pp. 166-68.
- <sup>112</sup>*The Quarterly Journal of the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha*, New series, No. 1, April, 1916, p. 3.
- <sup>113</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *The History of the Indian National Congress* Vol. I, 1935 p. 10.
- <sup>114</sup>A. C. Majumdar, *op. cit.* p. 42.
- <sup>115</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.* Vol. I. p. 11.
- <sup>116</sup>*Indian Spectator*, December 21, 1884.
- <sup>117</sup>*The Indian Review*, December 1905, p. 828
- <sup>118</sup>*Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 172.
- <sup>119</sup>B. L. Grover, "The Genesis of the Indian National Congress" *Journal of Indian History*, December 1963, Vol. XII, p. 610
- <sup>120</sup>F.M. De Mello, *The Indian National Congress*, (1934), p. 2
- <sup>121</sup>W. Wedderburn, *Allan Octavian Hume*, p. 66.
- <sup>122</sup>A.C. Majumdar, *op. cit.* p. 46.
- <sup>123</sup>Wedderburn, *op. cit.* p. 52.
- <sup>124</sup>Cited in G.A. Natesan (ed) *Indian Politics*, (1898), pp. VII-VIII.
- <sup>125</sup>S.K. Ratcliffe, *Sir W. Wedderburn and the Indian Social Reform Movement*, (1923), p. 60,
- <sup>126</sup>Wedderburn, *op. cit.* p. 77.
- <sup>127</sup>Christine Dobbin, *op. cit.* p. 38.
- <sup>128</sup>Annie Besant, *How India Wrought for Freedom* (1915), p. 15.
- <sup>129</sup>B.B. Majumdar, and B.P. Majumdar, *Congress and Congressmen in the Pre-Gandhian Era 1885-1917*, (1967) pp. 3-4
- <sup>130</sup>Cited in Andrews and Mookerjee, *op. cit.* p. 84.
- <sup>131</sup>Wedderburn, *op. cit.* p. 53
- <sup>132</sup>*Ibid*, p. 65,
- <sup>133</sup>*Report of the Second Indian National Congress*, 1886, p. 53.
- <sup>134</sup>B. L. Grover, *A Documentary Study of British Policy towards Indian Nationalism 1885-1909*, p. 42
- <sup>135</sup>B.C. Pal, *The National Congress*, (1887), p. 5.
- <sup>136</sup>H. Whitehead, *Indian Problems in Religion, Education and Politics*, (1924), p. 217.
- <sup>137</sup>Lord Dufferin, *Speeches Delivered in India 1884-88*, (1890), pp. 237-44.
- <sup>138</sup>A.C. Majumdar, *op. cit.* pp. 80-87.
- <sup>139</sup>B.L. Grover, *A Documentary Study of British Policy towards Indian Nationalism*, p. 206.
- <sup>140</sup>Cited in C.H. Phillips (ed) *The Evolution of India and Pakistan. Selected Documents 1858-1947*, p. 145.
- <sup>141</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Vol. I. *op. cit.*, p. 5.
- <sup>142</sup>Charles H. Heimsath, *op. cit.* pp. 132-33.
- <sup>143</sup>Sir Renigald Coupland, *India—A Restatement* (1945) pp. 91-92.

- <sup>144</sup>Robert Bruce T. McCully, *English Education and the Origin of Indian Nationalism* pp. 177.
- <sup>145</sup>A. Ali, "A cry from the Indian Mohammedans", *Nineteenth Century* Vol. XII, July-December, 1882, p. 201.
- <sup>146</sup>T. R. Metcalf, *The Aftermath of Revolt* (1965) pp. 298-304.
- <sup>147</sup>W. C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India* (1943) p. 163.
- <sup>148</sup>W. W. Hunter, *Indian Mussalmans, Are they bound in conscience to rise against the Queen?* (1871) pp. 159-72.
- <sup>149</sup>G. Morrison, "Mohammedan Movements" in J. Cummings (ed) *Political India* (1932) p. 88.
- <sup>150</sup>B. B. Majumdar, *History of Indian Political Associations*, p. 221.
- <sup>151</sup>Jyotish Chandra Das Gupta, *A National Biography for India*, (1911) p. 89.
- <sup>152</sup>Thacker's *Directory for Bengal, North-western Provinces for 1865*, (1865) p. 214.
- <sup>153</sup>*A Quarter century of the Mohammedan Literacy Society of Calcutta* (1899).
- <sup>154</sup>*The Rules and Objects of the National Mohammedan Association with a list of the members* (1882) p. 5.
- <sup>155</sup>B. B. Majumdar, *History of Indian Political Associations*, p. 225.
- <sup>156</sup>Rafia Zakaria, *Rise of Muslims in Indian Politics, An Analysis of Developments from 1858 to 1906*, p. 39.
- <sup>157</sup>Correspondence on the subject of the Education of the Mohammedan Community in British India and their Employment in the public service generally, selections from the records of the Government of India. No. CCV, Home Department serial No 2, Calcutta, 1886, Part 3, pp. 242-44.
- <sup>158</sup>P. Sharan, *The Imperial Legislative Council of India*, (1961) pp. 73-74.
- <sup>159</sup>*The Statesman*, December 19, 1886.
- <sup>160</sup>Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims. A Political History*, (1858-1947).
- <sup>161</sup>*The Calcutta Review*, July, 1889, Vol LXXXIX pp. IX-XI.
- <sup>162</sup>William T. de Bary (ed) *Sources of Indian Tradition*, (1958) pp. 744-45.
- <sup>163</sup>G. F. I. Graham, *The Life and work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan*, (1909) p. 128.
- <sup>164</sup>L. S. S. O' Malley (ed) *Modern India and the West. A Study of the Interaction of their Civilisation*, pp. 389-416.
- <sup>165</sup>S. Abid Husain, *The Destiny of Indian Muslims* p. 28.
- <sup>166</sup>Sir Syed Ahmed Khan *The Present State of Indian Politics*, (1888) pp. 27-28.
- <sup>167</sup>Cited in G. A. Natesan (ed) *Eminent Mussalmans*, (n.d.) p. 32.
- <sup>168</sup>*The Pioneer*, January 11, 1888.
- <sup>169</sup>W. H. Gregory, "Loyalty of the Indian Mussalmans", *Nineteenth Century*, December 1886, pp. 886-900.
- <sup>170</sup>Sunderlal, *A Study of the Hindu-Muslim Problem in India* pp. 119-20.
- <sup>171</sup>A. Mehra and A. Patwardhan, *The Communal Triangle in India* (2nd ed, 1942) pp. 57-61.
- <sup>172</sup>Theodore Beck, "In what will it End" *The Pioneer Mail*, May 16, 1888.
- <sup>173</sup>R. P. Masani, *Dadabhai Naoroji : The Grand Old Man of India* (1939) p. 303.
- <sup>174</sup>H. E. M. James, "Reflections on the Way Home" *National Review*, November, 1893, pp. 342-46.
- <sup>175</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *Pakistan, The Formative Phase 1857-1948*, p. 21.
- <sup>176</sup>B. C. Pal, *Momories of My Life and Times*, Vol. I, p. 417.
- <sup>177</sup>S. Abid Husain, *op. cit.* pp. 29-30.
- <sup>178</sup>Cited in Witkins, *Indian National Congress*, pp. 67-93.
- <sup>179</sup>Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, *The Present State of Indian Politics*, p. 10.
- <sup>180</sup>*Ibid*, p. 18.
- <sup>181</sup>*Ibid*, p. 1.
- <sup>182</sup>H. C. E. Zacharias, *Renascent India*, p. 120.
- <sup>183</sup>Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, *op. cit.* pp. 11-12.
- <sup>184</sup>Tyabji to Amir Ali, December 3, 1887, *Tyabji Papers*.
- <sup>185</sup>*Source Material for a History of the Freedom Movement in India* (collected from Bombay Government Records) Vol. II, pp. 67-69.
- <sup>186</sup>Hume's statement, cited in the *Pioneer*, November 7, 1888.
- <sup>187</sup>Graham, *op. cit.* p. 273.
- <sup>188</sup>H. C. E. Zacharias, *op. cit.* p. 120.

- <sup>189</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, (1946) pp. 103-4.
- <sup>190</sup>*The Indian Mirror*, October 16, 1888.
- <sup>191</sup>B.C. Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times*, Vol. II. p. 88.
- <sup>192</sup>B.B. Majumdar and B.P. Majumdar, *op. cit.* pp. 87-88.
- <sup>193</sup>R.C. Majumdar, *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. p. 428.
- <sup>194</sup>S. Abid. Husain, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
- <sup>195</sup>James Samuelson, *India Past and Present*, p. 320.
- <sup>196</sup>*The Indian Mirror*, January 25, 1888.
- <sup>197</sup>*The Tribune*, October 27, November 17, December 5, and 19, 1888.
- <sup>198</sup>Mohammad Noman, *Muslim India : Rise and Growth of the All India Muslim League*, (1942) p. 40.
- <sup>199</sup>Hafeez Malik, *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, (1963) p. 196.
- <sup>200</sup>Haridas Mukerjee and Uma Mukerjee, *The Growth of Nationalism in India 1857-1905*, (1957) p. 164.
- <sup>201</sup>B.B. Majumdar, "The Congress and the Moslems" *The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, Vol. No. 2, 1965-66.
- <sup>202</sup>*Report of the Fifth Indian National Congress*, 1889, pp. 39-115.
- <sup>203</sup>Swami Shradhanand, *Inside Congress*, pp. 30-31.
- <sup>204</sup>*Report of the Eleventh Indian National Congress*, 1895, p. 15.
- <sup>205</sup>*Report of the Twelfth Indian National Congress*, 1896, pp. 1-39.
- <sup>206</sup>Editorials in the *Moslem Chronicle*, January 30, February 20, 1897.
- <sup>207</sup>B.B. Majumdar and B.P. Majumdar, *op. cit.* pp. 90-94.
- <sup>208</sup>P.C. Ghosh, *Indian National Congress* p. 23.
- <sup>209</sup>Surendra Nath Banerjee, *A Nation in Making*, p. 108.
- <sup>210</sup>John S. Hoyland, *Gopal Krishan Gokhale : His Life and Speeches*, (1933), p. 160.

## CHAPTER II

# INDIAN NATIONALISM AND EMERGENCE OF ASIAN CONSCIOUSNESS

THE INDIAN National Movement was not an isolated development. Growth of nationalism in India transformed the very outlook of the Indian people and therefore, politically awakened India could not remain in an *ivory tower* isolated from the main current of world events and especially from the developments in the Asian Continent in which India had played a dominant role since the dawn of human history. Though as a subject country all the thought and energy of nationalist India were directed towards the achievement of its own freedom, the Indian National Movement evinced keen interest in the neighbouring Asian countries and developed an Asian consciousness or the spirit of fellow-feeling with Asian nations. Leaders of Nationalist India impressed upon the people to get into the habit of looking at India as a part of the wide Asian World. This strong Asian-bias became a dominant feature of the outlook of the Nationalist India and from the very inception closer collaboration with fellow-Asians became one of the objectives of the movement (Indian National Movement).<sup>1</sup> A sense of fellow-feeling with the Asian nations became so deeply coveted an idea with the nationalist leaders that one of the remarkable developments in India in the 20th century has been the growth of what, for want of a better term, may be described as *Asian Consciousness*.<sup>2</sup>

As most of the Asian countries were under the domination of Western powers and were thus, *comrades-in-bondage*, Nationalist India realised that the basic problem of India and Asia was the same. In all the countries of Asia some sort of freedom struggle was going on and at most places it was against the western domination. Leaders of Nationalist India realised that India's struggle for freedom was a part of the freedom struggles going on in Asia. Imbued, thus, with a sense of Asian Consciousness and moved by a motive to forge Asian solidarity the Indian National Movement emphasised the need of closer collaboration among the national movements of Asia for eliminating the common enemy *i.e.*, Western imperialism. Leaders of Nationalist India were eager to derive benefit from the freedom struggles of all Asian countries and to lend their support to the similarly placed nations of the continent. They became anxious to co-ordinate Indian struggle for freedom with the freedom struggles of the other Asian nations, to establish fraternal relations with the Asian people and to share the feeling of joy and sorrow with fellow Asians. Since Asia was regarded as *whitemen's burden* and a continent of fallen race the Indian leaders did not miss any opportunity to assert Asia's special role in world politics and to place Asia on the map of the world. Nationalist India drew up plans

often for regional integration in Asia and urged the Asiatic nations to co-operate with India in the task to give a concrete shape to these schemes.

Indian attempts for establishing close collaboration with Asian nations were the inevitable results of the political, strategic, geographical and cultural factors. Politically, India occupied the most vital point in the Western imperial system. India was the pivot of British Empire, and *the brightest Jewel in the imperial diadem*.<sup>3</sup> Strategic and geographical significance of India for the British Empire was rightly conceived by Lord Curzon who observed :

"India is like a fortress with the vast moat of the sea on two of her faces and with mountains for her walls on the remainder; but beyond these walls, which are sometimes by no means of insuperable height and admit of being easily penetrated, extends a glacis of varying breadth and dimension. We do not want to occupy it, but we also can not afford to see it occupied by our foes. We are quite content to let it remain in the hands of our allies and friends, but if rival and unfriendly influences creep into it and lodge themselves right under our walls, we are compelled to intervene because a danger would thereby grow up that would one day menace our security. That is the secret of the whole position in Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, Tibet, and as far eastwards as Siam. He would be a short-sighted commander who merely manned his ramparts in India and did not look beyond".<sup>4</sup>

The need to protect British India Empire had cost the freedom of a large number of Asian countries. Protection of Indian Empire was the most important motive behind British aggression in Persia, Mesopotamia, Afghanistan, Tibet, Burma and Egypt. British India constituted the main base which sustained British imperialism in Asia. Britain used India as a "base of the British Empire in the East" and pursued imperialistic policies in Asia on the strength of the Indian army which was largely maintained out of India's money.<sup>5</sup> In its critical battles against nationalist movements in Asia the British used India as the recruiting ground and as the base of military operations for suppressing nationalist movements in Asia.

Political and national awakening of India made Indians conscious of the fact that India was the hub of the British imperialism in Asia and instilled in them a guilt consciousness for being responsible for the enslavement of other Asian countries. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the president of the extraordinary session of the Indian National Congress held in 1923, very significantly pointed out that the desire to perpetuate the slavery of India had made the possession of Suez Canal essential for the British and to keep a stronghold on India the freedom of Arabia was sacrificed. He further maintained that India had been responsible for the slavery of the Middle Eastern Countries. So he urged the Indians to make a common cause with the Universal Struggle of Eastern nations to shake off fetters of slavery.<sup>6</sup> In the Congress against Imperialism held at Brussels in February 1927 Jawahar Lal Nehru himself admitted that other lands had suffered and were suffering still on account of India because British used Indian troops to crush the nationalist uprisings of these lands.<sup>7</sup> This realisation opened up a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the nationalist leaders for the sufferings of the people of these countries fighting for independence against the dead weight of the Western imperialism under which most of the

Asian countries were groaning. These leaders believed that India held the remedy of imperialism and that once India became free, the whole edifice of Western imperialism in Asia would collapse like a house of cards. To them free India was the best and surest guarantee of a free Asia. Mahatma Gandhi very aptly declared :

"India was the key to the exploitation of the Asiatic and other non European races of the Earth. She is held under bondage not merely for the sake of her own exploitation but that of her neighbours near and distant".<sup>8</sup> India's freedom, Gandhi believed, would be the first death blow to the "insolent exploitation of the nations of Asia and Africa".<sup>9</sup> Keeping in view the share India had contributed in purchasing the freedom of the Asiatic and African nations ; "My ambition is much higher than independence. Through the deliverance of India, I seek to deliver the so-called weaker races of the earth from the crushing heels of Western exploitation".<sup>10</sup> This assumption gave birth to a passionate concern in India for the freedom of Asian countries and a desire to live in friendly ties with them.

Geography had always been a compelling factor in the political life of a nation and geographically India had been the meeting point of whole of Asia. Jawahar Lal Nehru realised this geographical importance of India and wrote :

"It is fitting that India should play her role in this new phase of Asian development. Apart from the fact that India herself is emerging into freedom and independence, she is the natural centre and focal point of the many forces at work in Asia. Geography is a compelling factor, and geographically she is so situated as to be the meeting point of Western and Northern and Eastern and South-East Asia. Because of this, the history of India is long history of her relations with the other countries of Asia".<sup>11</sup>

On another occasion Nehru observed :

"India is very curiously placed in Asia and her history has been governed a great deal by the geographical factor plus other factors. Whichever problem in Asia you may take up, some-how or other India comes into the picture. Whether you think in terms of China or the Middle East or South East Asia, India immediately comes into the picture".<sup>12</sup> This geographical privilege which India alone enjoyed in Asia actuated the Indian leaders to look to the fellow Asian countries.

If geographically India constituted the centre of Asia she was culturally the pivot round which the other cultural systems of the continent revolved. Indians were so placed that a part of their population, the Muslims had cultural affinity with the countries in the West Asia. The Hindus, who formed the bulk of the Indian population, were culturally closely associated with the countries lying in the east of the continent. This cultural uniqueness of India, Dr. M A. Ansari rightly pointed out in his presidential address for the Indian National Congress in 1927, made Indian leaders the champion of Asian interests and persuaded them to have close contacts with the Asian nations.<sup>13</sup>

India's oneness with Asian nations was the legacy of history which recorded lively contacts between India and her Asiatic neighbours. Historical and archeological researches done by both the western and eastern scholars made Indians aware of their past in which they had established close cultural contacts with the Asian

countries and had influenced the life, thought, art, architecture, culture and social and political life of the countries beyond geographical boundaries.<sup>14</sup> This recovery of the past cultural bonds of Asia with a common origin in India gave India a sense of kinship and fellow feeling with the rest of Asia and their own significance as a future Asian power.

Since India was the most politically conscious country among the enslaved nations of Asia; smaller neighbours turned to India for encouragement and support and it was equally natural for the Indian people to take a keen interest in their struggle for independence. All the Asian countries were *comrades-in bondage* engaged in a war against the imperialist policies of the European powers who followed similar policies throughout Asia in the wake of nationalist uprisings and were adamant to suppress these nationalist movements at any and every cost because the success or failure of any one was bound to affect the fortunes of all the colonial peoples. The Indian leadership was wise enough to realise that the basic problem of India and Asia was one and the same. Indian leaders felt a genuine sympathy for the nations placed under the Western domination.

The nature and actual working of the imperialist government in all the colonial countries had, in a sense, unified the subject people for achieving national freedom. The techniques and tricks of imperialist powers, their ruthless suppression of freedom movement and economic exploitation had been common throughout the colonial world. People exploited and ruled by similar type of powers naturally felt interested in one another's destiny. Thus in response to European colonialism Asian solidarity of suffering was bound to emerge.<sup>15</sup> K.M. Panikkar held the view that the sense of Asianism is exclusively the counterpart of the solidarity of European feeling.<sup>16</sup> Being herself a victim of Western imperialism India attempted to forge solidarity of the oppressed nations of Asia. Thus, the aim of eliminating Western imperialism by concerted efforts was the practical foundation of Asian solidarity. Indian attempts for Asian solidarity were animated by a spirit of common consciousness and reaction against the European domination.

But it must not be ignored that Indian attempts for close collaboration among the nations of Asia were also the outcome of the long tradition of India's special role in the history of the Asian continent. Since time immemorial India had played a significant role in Asia and politically awakened India by taking interests in the Asian countries was simply fulfilling the call of India's historical tradition. Further more, Indians had settled in several countries of Asia. To safeguard their interests and to avert clash between the Indian settlers and the citizens of those Asian countries Nationalist India emphasised the need of friendly relations between India and these Asian countries.

It was in the 20th century that Asianism became a marked feature of the outlook of the Indian National Movement. But, even in the 19th century Indian nationalists have developed Asian consciousness and had evinced interest in the affairs of the fellow Asians.

Even before the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885 the Indians had developed the spirit of oneness with Asian people. At a time when Western imperialism had reached its high-watermark and Asia was regarded as *whitemen's burden*, Keshab Chandra Sen, a *Brahmo Samaj* leader and a brilliant

product of the 19th century Indian Renaissance, spoke of Asia and impressed upon the people of India that they must get into the habit of looking at India as a part of the wide Asian world. In an age when the leading personality like Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, who was a "prophet"<sup>17</sup> of Indian cultural renaissance, thought in terms of Bengal alone, and seldom took into consideration the larger problem of promoting Indian nationalism.<sup>18</sup> Hem Chandra Banerjee who, as B.C. Pal wrote, "was our special favourite",<sup>19</sup> lamenting the fate of India, expressed surprise over the independence of China and Burma and uncivilised Japan,<sup>20</sup> the first big figure from the Indian world of learning who had the credit of having an Asia wide outlook was Keshab Chandra Sen. Even Ram Mohan Roy, whom Rabindra Nath Tagore regarded as *Bharat Pathik*,<sup>21</sup> spoke in terms of either Indian culture or world culture, but the idea of Asian unity, which came to the fore again in the writings of Rabindra Nath Tagore and Ananda Coomaraswamy, was first suggested by Keshab Chandra Sen.<sup>22</sup> Long before the Japanese artist Okakura Kakuzo proclaimed that "Asia is one"<sup>23</sup> and more than a decade before Swami Vivekananda, the father of Modern Indian Nationalism,<sup>24</sup> declared the spiritual unity of Asia,<sup>25</sup> Keshab Chandra Sen emphatically asserted the unity of Asia and Asian culture. In his lecture on *Asia's Message to Europe* delivered in 1883 Keshab Chandra Sen proudly proclaimed :

"I am a child of Asia. Her sorrows are my sorrows, her joys are my joys. From one end of Asia to another, I boast of a vast home a wide nationality, an extended kinship . . . To me the dust of Asia is far more precious than gold and silver".<sup>26</sup>

Asia, which lay prostrate before the mighty material progress of the West in the 19th century, was considered to be a continent inhabited by an inferior race. To place Asia on the cultural map of the world, to inject a sense of self-respect and self-confidence among the people of Asia and to explain the role Asia had played in the spiritual progress of the mankind, the restless soul of Keshab Chandra Sen spoke of the splendour and spiritual heritage of Asia and his thoughts were pregnant with Pan-Asiatic sentiments. He was moved to see the condition of the Asiatic people but he did not believe that the West was, and always has been, superior to the Orient. To disprove this notion Keshab Chandra Sen claimed Jesus Christ as an Asiatic and emphatically asserted the Asiatic origin of Christian civilisation.<sup>27</sup> In order to stimulate self-pride among the Asian people and to remove the notion of inherent inferiority of the Asiatics, Sen proclaimed that Christ was the product of Asia. In this lecture on "Jesus Christ—Asia and Europe" delivered in 1886 at Calcutta, he declared that Jesus Christ was an Asian and Christianity owed its birth to Asia. Continuing he stated :

"Christianity was founded and developed by Asiatics, and in Asia. Jesus is akin to my oriental habits of thought and feeling".<sup>28</sup> Claiming Jesus Christ as an Asiatic Sen further observed, "An Asiatic can read the imageries and the allegories of the Gospel, its description of natural sceneries, of customs and manners, with greater interest, and a fuller perception of their force and beauty, than Europeans can".<sup>29</sup>

By claiming Christ as an Asiatic he referred to the glorious cultural heritage of Asia. "In Christ", he further remarked, "we see not only the exaltedness of huma-

nity but also the grandeur of which Asiatic nature is susceptible".<sup>30</sup> In an age when Europeans regarded the Asiatics as an inferior race Keshab Chandra Sen emphasised the equality between the Europeans and the Asiatics. He said :

"The Universe is the cathedral, nature the high priest, and every man has access to his Father—an illiterate rustic or a profound philosopher, a throned monarch or a ragged clown, a European or an Indian".<sup>31</sup>

Pan-Asianism had so deeply crept into his thought that Keshab Chandra felt a genuine love and sympathy for the fellow Asian people. In one of his lectures Sen appealed to the conscience of Europe for the well being of China. He urged the British Government in 1870 to "abolish that iniquitous opium traffic which kills thousands of the poor Chinese people".<sup>32</sup> This love for China manifested in the speeches of Keshab Chandra, was the vivid expression of his Asian consciousness and his sense of comradeship with a fellow Asian people.

This great and brilliant representative of the Indian renaissance was moved to tears to see the complete domination of Europe on Asia. His resentment over the misfortune of the Asiatics under Western domination and his love and sincere sympathy for the nations of Asia groaning under the iron heels of imperialism found vent in his pan-Asiatic sentiments. Expressing his heartfelt sympathy for the similarly-placed people of Asia Keshab Chandra Sen wrote :

"Whence this plaintive and mournful cry, which so profoundly distresses the patriot's breast ? It seems that a whole continent is writhing in agony beneath the lash of oppression, and sending forth from the depths of its heart a deep wail of woe. Who is it that weeps ? Do ye hear ? It is India that weeps, nay, not India only; all Asia cries. Behold the sweet Angel of the East, into whose beauty the very colours of heaven seem to have been woven, the fair east, in russet mantle clothed, lies prostrate, a bleeding prisoner ? Who can measure the length and breadth, the height and depth of Asia's sufferings ? She has no peace; she knows no consolation. And what is the burden of her complaint ? The desperate onslaughts of Europe's haughty civilisation, she says, have brought sorrow into her heart, ignominy on her fair name, and death to her cherished institutions. Alas ! Before the formidable artillery of Europe's aggressive civilisation, the scriptures and prophets, the language and literature of the East, nay, her customs and manners, her social and domestic institutions, and her very industries have undergone a cruel slaughter. The rivers that flow eastward and the rivers that flow westward are crimson with Asiatic gore; yes, with the best blood of oriental life".<sup>33</sup>

This pathetic cry of the restless soul of Keshab Chandra Sen gave a pan-Asian slant to the emerging national movement in India. However, his pan-Asianism was not an aggressive doctrine directed against the West and did not aim at the creation of an Asiatic bloc against Europe. By Asian unity he did not mean that Asia must unite against the West. To him, pan-Asianism was a necessary step in the realisation of international co-operation and one world. In order to establish one world and harmony between the Asiatic and European people he asked the Asiatics to co-operate with the west for that larger ideal. He prayed for an international federation built on Christ's atonement and he had a firm faith in the spiritual alliance between the East and West.

In a lecture delivered in 1866 he boldly declared :

"In Christ Europe and Asia, the East and West, may learn to find harmony and unity."<sup>34</sup> He attempted to synthesise Hinduism, Islam and Christianity into an Indian National Church.<sup>35</sup> This New Dispensation of Keshab Chandra called for the harmonisation of all conflicting creeds and for the fusion of the East and West. He urged Europe to enter into the heart of Asia and Asia to enter into the mind of Europe and added "we instantly realise within ourselves an European Asia and an Asiatic Europe, a commingle of oriental and occidental ideas and principles."<sup>36</sup>

On another occasion he asserted, "In uniting the East and the West, the European and Asiatic faith and character, the Church of the New Dispensation works faithfully upon the lines laid down by Christ himself, and only seeks to amalgamate the Western and the Eastern Christianity. It is not a treaty of Christ and anti-Christ that is proposed, but the reconciliation of all in Christ."<sup>37</sup> Thus, Keshab Chandra's cry for Asian unity in spiritual and cultural fields never stood in the way of his cherished desire for international co-operation. Sen's incessant attempts to accomplish the fusion of the East and the West in spiritual field was highly appreciated by Lord Ronaldshay who very significantly observed :

"Keshab Chandra Sen, more perhaps than any other man, showed that the gulf between Europe and Asia might be bridged without the sacrifice of anything fundamental in the race-genius and race-culture of either. He showed how East and West might be complementary rather than antagonistic to one another."<sup>38</sup>

The pan-Asiatic sentiments expressed by the great and brilliant representative of the 19th century Indian renaissance were imbibed by the Indian National Movement which gathered momentum with the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885. In fact, Asianism as constituting a dominant feature of the Indian outlook was the original contribution of Keshab Chandra Sen. In other words, Keshab Chandra Sen was the prophet of pan-Asianism.

Some four years before the formation of the Indian National Congress which spearheaded the movement for Indian independence, Rabindra Nath Tagore, moved by a spirit of Asian consciousness, protested against the inhuman opium trade of the European merchants in China. In his article entitled "Death Traffic in China" Tagore decried the export of opium from India to China. This "earliest so-far-traced reference to Tagore's interest in Asian affairs"<sup>39</sup> was very deep and influenced the Indian nationalist thought in regard to the Asian problems. Even before Tagore's opposition to the opium traffic in China, The Amrita Bazar Patrika in 1874 published an article entitled "The Chinese and the English", in which it mentioned in detail the injuries done to the Chinese by the English and concluded by saying that the former were justified in regarding the latter people as "Satanic".<sup>40</sup>

The Indian National Congress also imbibed the spirit of Asianism generated by the Indian Renaissance and the representatives of the Indian awakening. Sympathy with a fellow Asian country was expressed in the very first session of the Indian National Congress held in 1885. As a consequence of the third Anglo-Burmese War Upper Burma was annexed to the Indian Empire by the British Government. The Indian National Congress deprecated the annexation of Burma. In his resolution moved at the Congress session Phiroz Shah Mehta regarded the

annexation as unjust, immoral and unwise.<sup>41</sup> Beyond doubt, the fear of heavy taxation was the ground of opposition to annexation, but behind the opposition to the annexation was the sympathy of the Indian people for their neighbour. It was a protest against the British aggressive or forward policy in Asia. In the Congress session of 1891 Disnshaw Wacha referred to the forcible seizure of Upper Burma and regarded the year of the annexation as the year of calamity for India. He further criticised the expansionist policy of the British Government beyond the eastern frontier of India in obedience to the call of "pious Manchester for the sale of the product of its spindles and looms."<sup>42</sup> This policy, he feared, might soon bring the Indian Government into clash with China which would bring disastrous consequences for India.<sup>43</sup>

Indian Muslims, like their co-religionists elsewhere, were affected by the pan-Islamic movement which began towards the end of the 19th century.<sup>44</sup> The revival of pan-Islamism in the last quarter of the 19th century under the able Stewardship of Abdul Hamid II, the sultan of Turkey, who desired to forge united front of the Muslim brotherhood to work as a bulwark against the Christian powers of Europe, influenced the Indian Muslims and the Muslims of India were drawn closer to Turkey with which they had sentimental, religious and cultural affinity. Indian Muslims, who were loyal to the sultan of Turkey as the religious and spiritual head of the Muslims of the world, came in touch with the pan-Islamic activities of Abdul Hamid II who established Press at Yeldiz from where notices and pamphlets on pan-Islamism were published for circulation among the Indian Muslims.<sup>45</sup>

Indian Muslims, under the influence of the pan Islamic movement, began to take casual interest in the affairs of Turkey and other Muslim countries. On the outbreak of hostilities between Turkey and the state of Servia in 1876 Abdul Latif, at considerable risk to his official position, convened a monster meeting of the Muslims of Calcutta at the Townhall, presided over it and devised means for raising funds in aid of the Turkish wounded as well as for the submission of a memorial on behalf of her Muslim subjects to Queen Victoria requesting her to extend her help to the Sultan of Turkey. The movement was followed up by similar demonstrations in other parts of India. The Turkish authorities in their official correspondence regarded Abdul Latif as the recognised representative of Islam in India.<sup>46</sup> During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, both the Hindus and Muslims of India united to express their sympathy for Turkey. This united demonstration of sympathy for Turkey surprised Anglo-Indians, who wanted to know the reasons why Hindus were supporting the cause of a Muslim power. The Hindu newspapers in their reply to the query of the Anglo-Indians frankly declared that the sympathy of Hindus was in favour of Turkey primarily because Turkey was an Asian power.<sup>47</sup>

The course of British foreign policy also added strength to the pan-Islamic movement in India. Indian Muslims under the influence of the teachings of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan were loyal to the British Government. But this scheme of Anglo-Muslim co-operation got a rude shock in 1897 when the Sultan of Turkey was at war with Greece. Hitherto Indian Muslims had firm faith that Britain would come to the rescue of Turkey whenever it is needed, but the pro-Greek policy of the British Government shattered this belief. Muslims in India, who were urged by their leaders to remain loyal to the British Government, became critical of the latter.

Britain came in for severe criticism for her pro-Greek attitude and Indian Muslims demonstrated their enthusiasm and sympathy for the Sultan of Turkey and sent innumerable letters congratulating the Sultan for Turkish victory in the Greco-Turkish War of 1897.<sup>48</sup> On the Idul Fitr of 1898 a large number of Muslims assembled at the Mosque in Regent's Park in Delhi and after prayers and report Professor Ishak prayed for the health of the Sultan and said "In no part of the Moslem world and in no annals of Islamic history were the faithful ever gifted with such an enlightened sovereign as the present one, who upholds the peace of Europe and universal Moslem Unity".<sup>49</sup> The demonstrative enthusiasm of the Indian Muslims for the Sultan of Turkey and their severe condemnation of Britain for her pro-Greek attitude in the Greco-Turkish war in 1897 gave the authorities in India cause for anxiety.<sup>50</sup> Lord Hamilton, the Secretary of State, wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Elgin, on July 30, 1897"...

We have, however, a new element of intrigue and commotion introduced into India by the Pan-Islamic Council in Constantinople and the close connection which is being established between the Sultan and Indian Mohamedans".<sup>51</sup>

The British were alarmed at the massive sympathy the Muslims in India demonstrated for Turkey and the severe condemnation of the British policy.<sup>52</sup> The year 1899 saw a significant land mark in the history of Pan-Islamism in India. The British Government of India, having confirmed that the *Nedvet-Ul-Ulema* was held in March, 1898 at Kanpur, has sufficiently alerted against the spread of Pan-Islamism in India.<sup>53</sup> Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, was perturbed to see the Muslims drifting away from the camp of the British and expressed his disapproval of the new attitude of the Muslims towards the British rulers because it posed a serious threat to his novel plan of an "Anglo-Muslim alliance."<sup>54</sup>

Needless to say that the Indian Muslim's interest in Turkish affairs was largely the result of the common religious bond, that united the former with the latter. It was a call of religion, but, behind this was also a latent feeling of oneness and fellowship with an Asian country facing a perpetual danger of dismemberment by western powers. The special feature in this respect was that the pan-Islamism of Indian Muslims was converted into pan-Orientalism by the Hindus who supported the Muslims in their sympathy with Turkey.

At a time when the Indian National Congress was evincing interest in the Asian countries and the Muslims shared the joys and sorrows of the Turkish people some of the brilliant sons of India, like Vivekanand, added a new chapter to the developing trend of Indian fellow feeling with Asian countries by the visits to those countries. Vivekananda, a great representative of the Indian Renaissance and an ardent nationalist, visited Japan in 1893 and was much impressed by Japan and her nationalism. On his return to India he advised the Indian students to visit Japan and learn lessons from the Japanese people. He asked the Indian people to look at what was being done in Japan and follow her example. The sight of things prevailing in Japan at that time made Vivekananda unhappy when he compared it with the backwardness of his own country. With great bitterness he condemned India's tardiness, rebuked Indian students aiming at nothing higher than a clerkship and reprimanded Indian intellectuals for wasting their time and energy on the "touchableness or untouchableness of this food or that".<sup>55</sup> Vivekananda, like

Keshab Chandra Sen and the Japanese artist Okakuro Kakuzo, unhesitatingly proclaimed *the spiritual unity of Asia*.<sup>56</sup>

These visits of the neighbouring countries by Vivekananda revived the age old lively contacts between India and the countries of Asia and prepared the way for closer collaboration among the Asiatics. They did also the spade work for inter-Asian contacts. "Such travels", rightly observed by Werner Levi, "were undertaken for various reasons, but they never lacked political significance, and eventually the political motive became the most frequent and permanent".<sup>57</sup>

The resolutions of the Indian National Congress expressing sympathy with the Burmese people, the sorrow and resentment expressed by Keshab Chandra Sen on the humiliating condition Asia was subjected to, the travels of Vivekananda to the neighbour countries, the enthusiasm demonstrated by the Muslims at the time of Greco-Turkish war in 1897, the grave concern of Rabindra Nath Tagore and the Indian Press on the deteriorating economic condition of China confirmed the growth of Asian Consciousness among the Indian nationalists in the 19th century. Whereas the 20th century witnessed the fruition of this spirit of oneness with Asian nations developed in the 19th century.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>Sisir Gupta, *India and Regional Integration in Asia* (1864) p. 28.
- <sup>2</sup>Bimal Prasad, "Indian Nationalism and Asian Consciousness 1920-47", *Studies in Asian History* (1969). p. 277.
- <sup>3</sup>R.G. Pradhan, "Indian Affairs in England", *The Indian Review*, October, 1907, p. 736.
- <sup>4</sup>Cited in J.C. Kundra, *Indian Foreign Policy 1947-54* (1955) pp. 32-33.
- <sup>5</sup>N.V. Sovani, "British Impact on India after 1850-57". Cited in B.G. Gokhale, *The Making of the Indian Nation*. p. 189.
- <sup>6</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1923 Vol. II, p. 193.
- <sup>7</sup>G.H. Jansen, *Afro-Asia and Non-Alignment* p. 30.
- <sup>8</sup>*Young India*, February 3, 1927.
- <sup>9</sup>R.K. Prabhu and U.R. Rao, *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi* p. 89.
- <sup>10</sup>Quoted in U.R. Rao, "Gandhiji on Asia", *United Asia*. Vol. I 1948, p. 59.
- <sup>11</sup>*Jawahar Lal Nehru's speeches, 1947-49*, p. 302.
- <sup>12</sup>*Ibid*, p. 254.
- <sup>13</sup>*Report of the Forty-second Indian National Congress* p. 22.
- <sup>14</sup>S.K.V. Puntambekar, *The Developing Unity of Asia* p. 69.
- <sup>15</sup>Damodar P. Singhal, *Nationalism in India and other Historical Essays* (1967). p. 299.
- <sup>16</sup>K.M. Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance*, p. 322.
- <sup>17</sup>Bipin Chandra Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times*, Vol. I (1932), p. 226.
- <sup>18</sup>B.B. Majumdar, *History of Indian Social and Political Ideas : From Ram Mohan to Dayananda* (1967) p. 179.
- <sup>19</sup>B.C. Pal, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-29.
- <sup>20</sup>K.K. Datta, *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in India* (1965) p. 4
- <sup>21</sup>Sisir Kumar Mitra, *Resurgent India* (1963) p. 77.
- <sup>22</sup>V.S. Narvane, *Modern Indian Thought : A Philosophical Survey* (1964) p. 42.
- <sup>23</sup>Quoted in G.H. Jansen, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
- <sup>24</sup>R.G. Pradhan, *India's struggle for Swaraj* (1930) p. 60.
- <sup>25</sup>D.N. Verma. "India and Asian Solidarity 1900-1939", *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*, Vol. XLIX January-December 1963, p. 318.
- <sup>26</sup>Keshab Chandra Sen, *Lectures in India* (1904) p. 53.
- <sup>27</sup>Keshab Chandra Sen, *Lectures in India* (1901) pp. 33-34.
- <sup>28</sup>P.C. Majumdar, *The Life and Teachings of Keshab Chandra Sen* (1887) p. 177.
- <sup>29</sup>Keshab Chandra Sen, *Lectures in India* (1901) pp. 33-34.
- <sup>30</sup>*Ibid*.
- <sup>31</sup>M.L. Parikh, *Brahmarshi Keshab Chandra Sen*, p. 36.
- <sup>32</sup>*Keshab Chandra Sen in England* Vol. I p. 135.
- <sup>33</sup>Kalidas Nag, *Greater India* (1960) p. 737.
- <sup>34</sup>Keshab Chandra Sen : *Lectures in India* (1901) p. 34.
- <sup>35</sup>William Theodore De Bary (ed) *Sources of Indian Tradition* (1958) p. 621.
- <sup>36</sup>*Ibid*, p. 627.
- <sup>37</sup>Max Muller, *Ram Mohan to Ramakrishna* (1952) p. 57.
- <sup>38</sup>Lord Ronaldshay, *The Heart of Aryavarta : The Psychology of Indian Unrest* (1925) p. 53.
- <sup>39</sup>Kalidas Nag, *Discovery of Asia*. p. 9.
- <sup>40</sup>Cited in *Friend of India*, May 1, 1874.
- <sup>41</sup>*Proceedings of the First-Indian National Congress, 1885*, (1905) pp. 74-75.
- <sup>42</sup>*Report of the Seventh Indian National Congress* p. 31.
- <sup>43</sup>*Ibid*
- <sup>44</sup>Hans Kohn, *A History of Nationalism in the East*. (1929) pp. 48-49.
- <sup>45</sup>De Lacy O' Leary, *Islam at the Cross Roads* (1923) p. 121.
- <sup>46</sup>J.C. Das Gupta, *op. cit.* p. 95.
- <sup>47</sup>*Hindoo Patriot*, August, 23, 1877, Editorial in *Indian Daily News* August 31, 1877.
- <sup>48</sup>*Proceedings No. 165, April, 1898 Foreign Deptt. Government of India*.

<sup>49</sup>*Proceeding No. 124, June, 1899, Foreign Deptt. Government of India.*

<sup>50</sup>Lakshmi Kant Choudhary, 'The Pan-Islamic Movement in India', *Current Studies*, Vol. XIV, April, 1964 (A Patna College Research Journal) p. 97.

<sup>51</sup>R.C. Majumdar, *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. 1. p. 421.

<sup>52</sup>A.P. Macdonnel, the Lieutenant-Governor of the North West Provinces, to Elgin, the Viceroy, July, 16 and August 22, 1897, *Elgin Papers*, MSS Eur F. 841-11. Nos. 36 and 53.

<sup>53</sup>Lakshmi Kant Choudhary, *op. cit* ; p. 98.

<sup>54</sup>A.H. Albiruni, *Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India* (1950) p. 57-58.

<sup>55</sup>A.R. Desai, *Social Background of India Nationalism*, (1954), p. 67.

<sup>56</sup>Werner Levei, *Free India in Asia* (1954), p. 19.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*

### CHAPTER III

## INDIAN NATIONALISM AND ASIA 1900-1918

THE NATIONALIST India, with the beginning of the 20th century, entered into a new phase of its career and a new horizon full of hopes, appeared before the Indians. The Indian National Congress, which spearheaded the Indian struggle for freedom right up to the achievement of independence in 1947, was in the first thirty years of its existence, very moderate in its attitude towards the British and most of its leaders believed that independence could best be achieved by co-operation with the British government itself. Leaders like Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Surendranath Banerjee, Rash Behari Ghose, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Dadabhai Naoroji, Phiroz Shah Mehta and others, who belonged to the so-called Moderate group of the Congress, did not want complete independence for India and absolute severance of India from Britain. The Moderates were the friends of constitutional evolution and the enemies of a violent revolution.<sup>1</sup> Gokhale, the greatest of the Moderate Congressmen, incorporated the ideal of colonial self-government in the Preamble to the rules of his Servants of India Society founded in June 1905.<sup>2</sup> In his presidential address to the 21st Session of the Indian National Congress, Gokhale declared that the goal of the Congress was that India should be governed in the interests of the Indians themselves, and that in course of time a form of Government should be attained in this country similar to what existed in the self-governing colonies of the British Empire.<sup>3</sup> Gokhale and S.P. Sinha thought British connection beneficial so much so that they said to Lord Hardinge<sup>4</sup> and Lady Minto<sup>5</sup> respectively that if the British immediately left the country then no sooner had they reached Aden than Indians would have to cable them asking them to come back.

Although for a period of three decades the leadership of the Congress was held by the Moderates but by the middle of the first decade of the 20th century a new class of nationalists emerged and posed a serious breach with the Moderate leadership. This group of nationalists, known as Extremists, aimed at complete freedom of India from alien rule and considered the mild methods of moderation and loyalty to be insufficient for the liberation of the motherland. The inadequacy of the constitutional means, the unwise acts of Curzon administration, the partition of Bengal in 1905, the victory of Japan in the Russo-Japanese war of 1905, the deteriorating economic condition of the country and the outbreaks of famine and plague in the closing and the early years of the 19th and the 20th centuries respectively added fuel to the fire of the discontent of the leaders and the extremists made their head way.

The extremists found their leaders in Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai,

Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghose. Long before in 1893-94 Aurobindo Ghose, in a series of articles published in the *Indu Prakash*, had made bitter attacks on the policies of the Congress and accused its leaders of timidity and asked for vigorous attempts to prove their worth.<sup>6</sup> Bal Gangadhar Tilak, who brought political philosophy in India from heaven to earth, from the council Hall or the Congress *mandap* to the street and the market,<sup>7</sup> was the greatest of the extremist leaders. Criticising the policy of the Moderates, he observed :

“There is no empire lost by a free grant of concessions by the rulers to the ruled”.<sup>8</sup> Infact, he did not believe that benevolence had any place in politics and that any political concession would be granted to Indians by the British rulers out of purely benevolent motives.<sup>9</sup> He asked his countrymen to boycott the English in every way and assured them that “if you can, you are free from tomorrow”.<sup>10</sup> Bipin Chandra Pal also assured the Indians that they could be free by refusing to co-operate with the British rulers in the work of carrying on the administration of the country.<sup>11</sup> Lala Lajpat Rai advocated the need for a struggle within the Congress and accused the Congress of having created the false impression that it could gain political reforms by merely passing resolutions and delivering speeches.<sup>12</sup> “The first principle which every Indian politician ought to realise”, Lajpat Rai said :

“No nation is worthy of any political status if it can not distinguish between begging rights and claiming them”.<sup>13</sup> Speaking on the occasion of the anniversary celebration of the *Arya Samaj*, Lajpat Rai called upon the people to carry their struggle for freedom and observed, “the tree of the nation calls for blood, world history was written in letters of blood, let us crown our national movement with martyrdom”.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, by the middle of the first decade of the 20th century the Congress was faced with a serious danger of internal differences. Two groups in the Congress appeared and they seemed to be face to face with each other. The partition of Bengal added impetus to extremism in Indian politics<sup>15</sup> and even the advocates of constitutional methods felt shocked by Curzon’s repressive policy.<sup>16</sup> Widespread resentment was expressed by the people against the partition and the Congress launched a plan of “Swadeshi and Boycott”. The Extremists desired to boycott all that was British,<sup>17</sup> whereas the Moderates maintained that the Congress resolution of 1905 had not supported a policy of total political boycott of the Government of India.<sup>18</sup> The Moderates regarded the policy of boycott as a temporary measure adopted for the purpose of modifying the partition of Bengal,<sup>19</sup> the Extremists did not want that the policy of boycott should be confined to Bengal alone but it should move from province to province<sup>20</sup> and they wanted to leave the government severely alone.<sup>21</sup> Aurobindo Ghose frankly stated, “Boycott of foreign goods is a necessary condition for the encouragement of Swadeshi industries, boycott of government schools is a necessary condition for the growth of national education, boycott of British Courts is a necessary condition for the spread of arbitration”.<sup>22</sup>

The two groups in the Congress differed from one another in their objectives and the methods and the clash between the two seemed to be inevitable. The signs of this clash manifested at the 21st Session of the Congress held at Benaras in

December, 1905 on the issue as to what the Congress was to do when the Prince of Wales visited India.<sup>23</sup> The growing rift in the Congress became vivid in 1906 when Tilak's candidature for the presidency of the Congress was proposed by the Extremists and the Moderates opposed it.<sup>24</sup> The split in the Congress fold was averted in 1906 but it could not be permanently averted and the schism within the Congress came to the surface in 1907 when there arose the controversy over the candidature for the presidency of the 23rd Session to be held at Surat. The extremists proposed Lajpat Rai, while the Moderates nominated Rash Behari Ghose. Some untoward incidents took place and the Surat Congress ended in pandemonium with shoes, sticks and chairs flying through the air.<sup>25</sup> The Moderates reorganised the Congress in such a way as to exclude the Extremists and according to the first article of its new constitution drawn upon in 1908, the objective of the Congress was declared to be the "attainment by the people of India a system of government similar to that enjoyed by the self governing members of the British Empire and participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members".<sup>26</sup>

At a time when the Congress was divided into two irreconcilable camps, Indian Nationalism was confronted with another impediment which was to prove grave and disastrous in future. The British policy to divide and rule,<sup>27</sup> Hindu agitation against the partition of Bengal,<sup>28</sup> the pro-Muslim policy of the government, and the Muslim's fear of the domination of the Hindus fanned the Muslim separatism. Morley, the Secretary of State for India, promised the first instalment of reforms in the House of Commons in August, 1906 and also declared that the reforms granted would be on the lines desired by the Congress. This statement of the Secretary of State caused concern among the Muslim who began to ask as to what would be the fate of the Indian Muslims if the reforms were to be granted on the lines desired by the Congress. This anxiety compelled Nawab Mehdi Ali Khan, popularly known as Mohasin-ul-Mulk, the Secretary of Aligarh College, to write a letter to W.A.J. Archbold, the principal of the college, who was staying at Simla at that time, seeking his permission and advice for a deputation to wait on the Viceroy to submit the view of Mohammedans on the matter of constitutional reforms.<sup>29</sup> Due to the incessant efforts of Mohasin-ul-Mulk, Archbold, Dunlop Smith, the private secretary of Minto, a deputation of thirty-five led by the Aga Khan, presented an address to the Viceroy on October 1, 1906. The deputationists demanded that if representative institutions were extended to India the government should take into consideration the political importance of the Muslim community and safeguard their interests in the municipal and local boards and provincial and imperial legislative councils.<sup>30</sup> Lord Minto gave a sympathetic hearing to the deputation and assured the delegation that he was entirely in accord with their case.<sup>31</sup> The delegation was characterised by Maulana Muhammad Ali as a *command performance*<sup>32</sup> and Rajendra Prasad held the view that the delegation was engineered by Archbold, the British Principal of Aligarh college.<sup>33</sup> The "Amrita Bazar Patrika" wrote on October 4, 1906: "The whole thing appears to be a got-up affair and fully engineered by interested officials So the all-India Mohammadan Deputation is neither all-India, nor all-Mohammedan, nor even a Deputation, properly so called. It is only an instrument in the hands of the officials to whitewash their doings".<sup>34</sup> To what extent the depu-

tation was engineered one could be known from the contemporary writings and statements of the officials. Buchan, the biographer of Minto, observed that Minto's reply to the Muslim Deputation undoubtedly prevented the ranks of sedition being swollen by Muslim recruits, an inestimable advantage in the day of trouble which was dawning.<sup>35</sup> Even Morley, in whom the Moderates had a firm faith, expressed his jubilation at the conduct of Minto, and looked upon the deputation as a master stroke of diplomacy or statesmanship.<sup>36</sup> M.S. Jain has taken great pains to prove that the Muslim deputation to Lord Minto was not a command performance.<sup>37</sup> Syed Razi Wasti wrote that the view that deputation was inspired "is to distort history and to underrate both Muslim political aspirations and the integrity and intellectual capability of Muslim leadership".<sup>38</sup> But the diary of Lady Minto,<sup>39</sup> and the detailed statement of Tufail Ahmad<sup>40</sup> and the view expressed by Ramsay MacDonald,<sup>41</sup> lent support to the notion that the Muslim Deputation was a planned scheme. Even Morley wrote on December 6, 1909 that it was Minto who had started the *Muslim here*.<sup>42</sup>

Encouraged by the patronage received from the government, the leading members of the deputation assembled at Dacca on December 30, 1906 and formed the All India Muslim League which was to promote among Indian Muslims feeling of loyalty towards the British Government, to protect the political and other rights of Indian Muslims and to place their needs and aspirations before the Government and to promote friendly feelings between Muslims and other communities of India.<sup>43</sup> The establishment of the Muslim League proved to be a mile-stone in the history of India and diversified the current of Indian nationalism into two different channels. It remained aloof from the Congress nationalism throughout the years 1907 and 1910<sup>44</sup> and the leaders of the League advised the Muslims to eschew the agitational policies of the Congress, to regard themselves as soldiers of a British regiment and to help in the continuance of the British rule.<sup>45</sup>

In spite of these impediments the Indian National Movement made itself a factor to be reckoned with and the British Government had to concede some concessions to the Indian people in 1909 in the form of Morley-Minto Reforms. Two Indians were admitted to the Council of the Secretary of State in London. One Indian was appointed as a member of Viceroy's Executive Council. In expanding the imperial and provincial legislative councils the Morley-Minto reforms introduced for the first time in Indian political system the principles of Communal electorate. Muslims and the land holders were given the concession of separate electorate.

The First World War occurred in 1914. India rendered highly valuable services to the Allies in men, money and munitions. The Indian National Congress and its meeting at Madras in December, 1914 conveyed to the King-Emperor and the people of England its profound devotion to the Throne, its unswerving allegiance to the British connection, and its firm resolve to stand by the empire, at all hazards and at all costs.<sup>46</sup> The Muslim League also remained loyal to the British *Raj* and Maulana Mohammed Ali wired to the Sultan of Turkey either to support Britain or to keep neutral in this war.<sup>47</sup> Satisfied with the co-operation of the Indians, the Secretary of State for India, E.S. Montague, declared on August 20, 1917 that more and more Indians would be given the opportunity to associate themselves with the every branch of the administration for the progressive realisation of responsible

government in India as an integral part of the British Empire.<sup>48</sup> With the help of Chelmsford, the Viceroy of India, Montague, produced a joint scheme of reforms, known as Montague-Chelmsford Reforms, which was published on July 8, 1918, and was embodied in the Government of India Act, of 1919. The Montague-Chelmsford Report could not satisfy the nationalist leaders and both Mrs. Annie Besant and Tilak characterised it as unworthy and unacceptable.<sup>49</sup> The Moderate leaders approved of the Report and stayed out of the Bombay Congress held in 1918 and held a separate conference of their own in November 1918.<sup>50</sup>

While the British Government was engaged in a critical battle with Germany, Austria and Turkey, some factors brought about Congress-League compromise. The Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907 about Persia, the war between Italy and Turkey and the pro-Italy policy of the British Government and several other factors prepared the way for Hindu-Muslim Unity. Britain's anti-Turkish policy in the Middle East and repressive measures in India drove Hindus and Muslims into each other's arms.<sup>51</sup> The Muslim League under the influence of Jinnah and Muzhar-ul-Huq adopted the Congress ideal of self-government in 1913 and both the Muslim League and the Congress held their annual session at Bombay in 1915. Muzhar-ul-Huq, who presided over the League session, and Lord S. P. Sinha, who presided over the Congress session, travelled to Bombay by the same train and both showed their presidential address to each other.<sup>52</sup> This growing consciousness of Hindu-Muslim Unity reached its climax in 1916 when both the Congress and the Muslim League held their annual sessions at Lucknow and concluded the Lucknow Pact by which the Congress agreed to separate electorates and both the organisations jointly formulated a scheme of reforms known as the Congress-League scheme.<sup>53</sup>

Thus during 1900-1918 the Indian National Movement made rapid progress and succeeded in compelling the British Government to concede two reform acts in 1909 and 1918-19. Both the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League co-operated with each other for the larger national interests during the stormy days of the First World War.

Although the Indian National Movement was engrossed in activities to register itself as a factor to be reckoned with during 1900-1918, politically awakened India did not remain aloof from the Asiatic neighbours with whom she shared much in common. India's Asian consciousness, developed in the 19th century, proceeded on a vigorous career with the beginning of the 20th century. As early as 1901, Rabindra Nath Tagore expressed Pan-Asian ideas<sup>54</sup> in the course of an appreciative review of Lowes Dickinson's Letters of John Chinaman. Towards the close of 1901 two Japanese Buddhist Scholars visited India and invited Swami Vivekanand to attend the proposed Congress of Religions in Japan. One of the visitors was the famous Japanese artist Okakura Kakuzo, "a devoted lover of India and an ardent champion of her freedom and that of the whole of Asia from foreign domination".<sup>55</sup> The Swami, who believed in the cultural unity of Asia,<sup>56</sup> spoke of Okakura—"We are two brothers who meet again, having come from these ends of the earth"<sup>57</sup> Not only this, the Indian nationalists noted with gratification Japan's recognition as an equal power by England as a result of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902. Indians, who wanted to place Asia on the map of the world and to shatter the belief of the inherent inferiority of the Asiatics, hailed the Alliance as the signal for the awakening of

Asia. Surendra Nath Benerjee in his presidential address to the Indian National Congress held in 1902, appreciated Japan's wonderful self-sacrifice, her patience, her fortitude, her indomitable energy which had won for her marvellous success in her ambitions.<sup>58</sup>

Victims of imperialism as they were, the Indian nationalists made scathing attack on the imperialist policy of Britain in Asia. The Indian National Congress criticised the forward policy of British-India Government and expressed its concern over the interference of the Government of India in the internal affairs of the neighbouring countries. The fear of Russian menace gave birth to Anglo-Russian rivalry and to counteract the growing Russian influence in Asia and to strengthen its influence in Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet, the British-India Government followed an ambitious foreign policy which caused resentment among the nationalist leaders in India. Any attempt on the part of the British Government to increase its influence in Asia was to result in the loss of the Asiatics which was considered to be the loss of the Indians themselves by the Indian leaders. Since the congress was opposed to the expansionist policy of the British-India Government, Lal Mohan Ghose condemned the British policy of interfering in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries as *pseudo-imperialism* which impelled some of the British authorities to seek new adventures beyond Indian frontiers whether in Afghanistan or in Burma or in Tibet.<sup>59</sup>

Curzon, the imperialist Viceroy of India, wanted to forestall Russian influence in Tibet. To establish British stronghold there he despatched the Younghusband Mission to Tibet. The Indian National Congress vehemently criticised British interference in the affairs of Tibet. Henry Cotton, who became the President of the Indian National Congress in 1904, made scathing criticism of this expansionist policy and described the despatch of the expedition as "a monstrous thing, an outrage and a blunder through and through."<sup>60</sup> Speaking from the Presidential chair of the Indian National Congress held in 1904, Henry Cotton characterised the despatch of Younghusband Mission as an act of aggression and unprovoked trespass, on others' property. The Congress deplored the ruthless slaughter of the unarmed Tibetan people whose only fault lay in resisting foreign invasion of their country. Indians had no interest in the expedition to Tibet which had been despatched to serve trade and imperial interests of the British. In spite of the disinterestedness of the Indian people, the Congress President pointed out, the total cost of the expedition had been imposed on the poverty ridden people of India.<sup>61</sup> Needless to say that the fear of heavy taxation stimulated the Indian leaders to criticise British expedition to Tibet but the sympathy expressed by the Indian leaders for the miserable lot of the Tibetans manifested the growing fellow-feeling with Asian neighbours in hours of trouble.

Indian leaders developed the habit of speaking on behalf of Asia. Hence anything and everything which had a demoralising effect on the Asian culture was highly resisted in India. Curzon, the Viceroy of India, who considered the Asiatic people as an inferior race, addressing the university convocation of Calcutta on February 11, 1905 remarked: "the highest ideal of truth is to a large extent a Western conception. Undoubtedly truth took a high place in moral codes of the West before it had been similarly honoured in the East, where craftiness and diplomatic wile have always been held in much repute... Oriental diplomacy meant... Some-

thing rather tortuous and hyper subtle. The same may be seen in Oriental literatures.<sup>62</sup> This statement sparked off a wave of resentment among the Indians and was severely condemned by the educated Indians who thought it derogatory to the prestige of the Oriental Culture. The Indian nationalists and the nationalist Press took up the statement as an insult to the Oriental people. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* characterised the statement as "a violation of his (Curzon) own ideas...when himself Governor-General and Viceroy, see (the Asians) with contemptuous eyes".<sup>63</sup> The statement was referred to be as capricious and absurd and even Rabindra Nath Tagore, who had a high regard for the Western Culture, joined in the countrywide agitation against Lord Curzon's unwarrantable attack on the veracity of Eastern people.<sup>64</sup>

The year 1905 witnessed remarkable developments in Asia as a whole. Lord Curzon effected the partition of Bengal in 1905 which caused widespread protest in the country. The whole nation was ablaze and from all corners of the country voices were raised to undo it. While such a nationwide resentment was fast developing in India, one of the dramatic events of history took place in the Far East where two powers—one a Europeans and the other Asiatic—were locked in a war over the question of Korea.

This epoch making event was the Russo-Japanese War which gave a new turn to the Asian history. The news of the Russo-Japanese war had an electrifying effect on Indian people and the Indian nationalists seized the opportunity to express their sympathy with Japan, an Asiatic power, engaged in a life and death struggle with a European power. While the war was going on, the *Hindustan Review* and *Kayastha Samachar*, an Indian Journal of repute, expressed sympathy with Japan and observed :

"The sympathy of India naturally goes to Japan and it is the universal wish of our countrymen that she may succeed in inflicting the severest possible blow on her military adversary."<sup>65</sup>

The victory of Japan over Russia sent a tremour all over Asia and Asian pride, hitherto battered by a continuous stream of Western conquests, was bolstered by the Japanese victory. The victory of Japan fired the imagination of Asian nationalists and it was warmly received especially in India. To the Indians, this war between Japan and Russia seemed to be a war between the East and the West, between Asia and Europe and the success of an Asian power in breaking the so-called invincibility of the West was hailed in every corner of Asia. Almost for the first time in the history of modern warfare an Asiatic army trained and disciplined by Asiatic Generals and equipped by War material and appliances of pure Asiatic make, had thoroughly beaten European force of one of the giant powers of the world. Hitherto, it was the fond illusion of European statesmen and thinkers that there was some inherent constitutional inferiority in the Asiatic which made his perpetual subordination and serfdom to European capitalists and exploiters inevitable. To this vicious and irritating vein of thought the Japanese victory gave a rude shock and this was the reason behind the Indian happiness over the Japanese victory in the war.

Japan became a symbol of Asian resurgence and a source of inspiration to the Indian nationalists in their struggle for freedom. The *Indian Review* represented the true feelings of the Indian people in its editorial remark which said "*wonderful and*

*marvellous*" Japan had humbled a huge European power, a by no means mean representative of all that is haughty and arrogant among the nations of the West.<sup>66</sup> Samay added :

"We (the people in the East) who are hated as cowards and imbecile, are proud of this triumph of the East in its terrible struggle with the West. We heartily congratulate thee, Japan, on thy wonderful courage, thy discipline, thy iron will, and thy indomitable energy thou alone hast saved the honour of the East, the downtrodden East."<sup>67</sup> The Bengalee, a nationalist daily of Calcutta, shared the joys of the Indian people over Japan's victory in the War and proudly proclaimed that the Asiatic race had broken the pride of the greatest power in Europe so thoroughly that not even hope of retirement is left.<sup>68</sup>

In India resurgent Japan became a symbol of hope. Indian National Movement found an impetus in the Japanese victory over Russia. Jawahar Lal Nehru also felt excited at the news of the Japanese victories. Writing of his own feelings at the news of the Japanese Victories he observed :

"I remember well how excited I used to get when news came of the Japanese victories. That excitement was shared by many a boy and girl and grown up in Asia. A great European power had been defeated; therefore Asia could still defeat Europe as it had done so often in the past. Nationalism spread more rapidly over the Eastern countries and the cry of *Asia for Asiatics* was heard. But this nationalism was not a mere return to the past, a clinging on to old customs and beliefs. Japan's victory was seen to be due to her adoption of the industrial methods of the West, and these ideas and methods became more popular all over the East.<sup>69</sup> Japanese victory, stirred up my enthusiasm and I waited eagerly for the papers for fresh news daily. I invested in a large number of books on Japan."<sup>70</sup>

Another contemporary Indian Nationalist, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, admired the achievements of Japan and advised the Indians to take lessons from Japanese people.<sup>71</sup> Gokhale showered his choicest praise on Japan "There can be no surer road", said Gokhale, "to a final success than that which Japan had trodden."<sup>72</sup> Infact, the achievement of Japan became a source of inspiration for India and for all Asia. He advised the Indians to show devotion to motherland in the same way as it was in Japan.<sup>73</sup> Tilak gave a similar advice to the Indians<sup>74</sup> and Tilak's paper *Keshari* wrote that a knowledge of the history of the rise of Japan had kindled in the people's mind a strong desire for *Swaraj*.<sup>75</sup> Rabindra Nath Tagore maintained :

"Japan's example has given heart to the rest of Asia. We have seen that the life and the strength are there in us, only the dead crust has to be removed."<sup>76</sup>

Similar views were expressed by Swami Vivekananda.<sup>77</sup> Mahatma Gandhi's outlook on military conflict between Japan and Russia was in favour of 'righteous Japanese' against aggressor Russia. Gandhi's newspaper declared its admiration for the sheer force of character of the Japanese who had brought themselves into the fore-front of the nations of the world. The journal considered Japan's victory as a beneficial symbol of a new Asia confronting the West.<sup>78</sup> Lala Lajpat Rai, popularly known as the *Lion of Punjab*, told the Indian people that Japan was a splendid example of what could be achieved by a nation guided by a benevolent national government to her people.<sup>79</sup> The pillars of the Indian national movement,

thus, made frequent reference to Japan for the promotion of national feeling<sup>80</sup> and the victories of Japan, rightly observed Morley, did not pass unobserved in India.<sup>81</sup> Japan's victory over Russia thrilled the hearts of the nationalist leaders and infused in them a new hope and vigour. The virtues of patriotism self-sacrifice shown by the Japanese impressed the younger generations in India and inspired them to free their country from foreign domination.<sup>82</sup>

What to say of the leaders, even the villagers were interested in the Russo-Japanese war and became jubilant on Japanese victories over Russia. An eye-witness to the popular Indian enthusiasm over Japanese victories against Russia, C.F. Andrews, wrote, "A stir of excitement passed over the North of India. Even the remote villagers talked over the victories of Japan as they sat in their circles and passed round the *huqqa* (pipe) at night."<sup>83</sup> To the average Indian nothing had happened in Asia like the Japanese victories over Russia since the Indian Mutiny of 1857. Even the most ignorant peasants tingled with the news of Japan's success. To the Muslims Russian reverses seemed to mark the limit of the expansion of the Christian nations over the world's surface. To the Hindus, "the old time glory and greatness of Asia seemed destined to return. The material aggrandisement of the European races at the expense of the East seemed at least to be checked. The whole of Buddha land from Ceylon to Japan might again become one in thought and life, Hinduism might once more bring forth its old treasures of spiritual culture for the benefit of mankind. Behind these dreams and visions was one exulting hope that the days of servitude to the West were over and the days of independence had dawned. Much had gone before to prepare the way for such a dawn of hope, the Japanese victories made it, for the first time, shining and radiant."<sup>84</sup>

The nationalist press expressed jubilation over Japan's victories and asked the Indian people to take lessons from the Japanese nation. The Daily Hitavadi advised the Indians to take a lesson from Japan in order to be qualified as civilised and enlightened.<sup>85</sup> The Amrita Bazar Patrika expressed a sense of relief that Japanese victories would mark an end to the exploitation of the East by the West.<sup>86</sup> The defeat of Russia, was expected, would save the Mussalmans (Turkey) and Buddhists (India) from the clutches of the Christians.<sup>87</sup> Another Indian Journal urged the Indians to make Japan as their ideal and to imitate her.<sup>88</sup> The Bangalee told the Indian people that the interests of India demanded that the sons of the country should, like the children of the land of the Rising Sun, acquire the power to adapt themselves to everchanging circumstances.<sup>89</sup>

Nationalist India shared the joys of the Japanese victories in such an abundant manner that an Indian student reading in Tokyo wrote to a Japanese Journal :

"You (the Japanese), perhaps, can not imagine to what extent they (the Indians) loved her (Japan). So great was the interest of our people in Japan, that our weekly papers turned into daily ones, and the Press had sometimes to publish extra issues. Every morning the people anxiously waited at their doors for the newsboy, and the students could not attend to the books without reading the telegrams (giving an account of the War). After the fall of Port Arthur we shared your joy and pride not to a small degree and the city of Calcutta and many other towns and villages were adorned with illuminations. Indeed we in India shared your pride more than, perhaps, the rest of the world

because to us the victory of Japan meant more than what met the eyes of the ordinary world."<sup>90</sup>

Continuing the student observed that even the very common man, who could just read the newspapers, could narrate the story of the Russo-Japanese War from the beginning to the end.<sup>91</sup> Mrs. Annie Besant in her presidential address for Indian National Congress held in 1917 referred to the impact of the Japanese Victory on India and the enthusiasm which Indians demonstrated on the victory of a fellow-Asian country over a European power.<sup>92</sup> A Bengali Journal, *Sri Vishnu Priya-c-Ananda Bazar Patrika*, expressed pleasure at the Japanese victory in the War and urged the Indian people to do what the Japanese people had done in Japan. It further wrote : "the delusive belief (of the Europeans and Americans) that Easterners are destined to remain in perpetual tutelage and servitude to Western will now probably disappear from many a Western mind."<sup>93</sup> Making an appeal to the Indian people to follow the example of Japan, the Journal asked, "If the rice-eating Jap is capable of throwing into utter rout and disorder the Russian Soldier, can not the rice-eating Indians (meaning Bengalees) also if properly trained, do the same?", and advised the English rulers to make no more attempt to trodden down the Indians like flies in the dust and assured the Indians that the East (India) was sure to triumph over the West (Britain) if it studied and emulated Japan.<sup>94</sup> Valentine Chirol, who had the opportunity to know the heat of the Indian mind in the post Russo-Japanese War era, also shared the views expressed by the above Journal.<sup>95</sup>

It was the Japanese victory over Russia which heralded a new spirit in India and in Indian politics. The emergence of Japan as a victorious nation convinced some of the Indians that physical strength was needed to win independence and thus partly influenced the growth of extremism in Indian politics.<sup>96</sup> Lovett also held the view that the restlessness in India for political freedom was stimulated by the achievements of Japan.<sup>97</sup> Prof. L.F. Rushbrook Williams and J. Campbell Ker, the two contemporary English men, in their study on the causes of the "Rise of the Left" in the Congress and those of "Subversive Movement" pointed out that the victory of Asiatic Japan over European Russia was an epoch making event and turned the tide of the national movement in India.<sup>98</sup> Growth of revolutionary activities in India was partly stimulated by the Japanese victories in the War. Several secret societies were organised and the records of the Home Department had referred to the establishment of a Physical force party among the Bengalees who appeared to have been inspired by the result of the Russo-Japanese war.<sup>99</sup>

There was a section of public opinion in India which thought that the Indian's Jubilation over the Janapese success in the war was not due to the fellow feeling of the Indians for the Japanese ; it was, on the contrary, due to the fact that Japan was an ally of the British Government which governed the Indian people. Tripura Hitaishi advanced the argument that "Japan had defeated a power (Russia) which was the bitterest foe of our (British) Government"<sup>100</sup> and hence the Indians were happy." A close study of the state of affairs in India of the time would rejected this view point. The enthusiasm and pleasure expressed by Indians on the Japanese victories over Russia symbolised the sympathy and a spirit of solidarity with Japan, an Asiatic power, against Russia, a European nation. This could be substantiated by the developments of the later years. When the Indians adopted Swadeshi as the

creed of their national movement they boycotted the foreign goods coming in India from all the alien nations but the Japanese goods were openly sold and purchased in India. Tilak's paper *Kesari* advocated giving preference to Japanese manufactures above all imported goods.<sup>101</sup> The real spirit of the state of affairs in India was truly expressed by the *Bengalee* which wrote: "Japanese success have evoked Pan-Asiatic feeling which India shares to the fullest extent. In the Home Affairs there is a new-born spirit which is striving to bring the reactionary Government of the country within the sphere of popular control. These are clear indications of the great Eastern revival."<sup>102</sup>

Thus, Japan became a model for India and the latter pinned up her hope of Asian solidarity in the rise of Japan and a close collaboration began to develop between these two Asian nations. Indian students began to visit Japan for higher studies. In 1898 two Indian students went to Japan. Indian students in Japan in November 1903 numbered fifteen and in 1906 this number rose to fifty-four.<sup>103</sup> The reason why the Indian students flocked to Japan for higher studies was the similarity between Japan and India in the educational methods and cultural approaches.<sup>104</sup> The Japanese gave sympathetic treatment to the Indian students studying in Japan.<sup>105</sup>

India's friendly feelings for Japan were manifested at the time when Indians launched a widespread boycott of foreign goods. While the nationalist leaders in India urged the people to boycott all foreign goods, they encouraged the free sale of Japanese goods. Large quantities of Japanese hosiery were openly sold and the boycott did not apply to the Japanese goods.<sup>106</sup> The *Indian Taxtile Journal* advised the Indians to seek those goods in Japan which the Indians were not capable to manufacture.<sup>107</sup> Tilak, in supporting the Congress resolution on *Swadeshi*, appealed to the Indians to show preference above all other to native and next, to Japanese manufactures.<sup>108</sup> The Indians expressed their sorrow at the sufferings of the Japanese caused by an earthquake and contributed something to help them which were gratefully acknowledged by the Japanese.<sup>109</sup> This growing solidarity between India and Japan encouraged mutual trade and export to Japan in five years following 1905 increased by four times and the Japanese goods which were imported in India increased by three times.<sup>110</sup> A Japanese businessman admitted that the export import trade between India and Japan increased in volume in the years that followed the Russo-Japanese War.<sup>111</sup> Some commercial concessions were given to the Indian exports to Japan and private Indian Capital got an easy entry into Japan. Furthermore, Japan adopted preferential tariff policy towards India.<sup>112</sup>

India's friendly gestures towards Japan were well received in Japan which, in turn, expressed moral sympathy with the Indian struggle for independence. Indian students were allowed to celebrate the anniversary of the Indian Hero Shivaji in Tokyo. Count Okuma, the Honorary President of the Japan-Indian Society, gave a spirited address and advised the Indian students to prove their worth for the independence they aimed at.<sup>113</sup> "The celebrations", wrote the *Bengalee*, "partook of the nature of the Pan-Asiatic demonstration".<sup>114</sup> Count Okuma advised the Indians to endeavour to invigorate the national spirit and added, "A nation is entitled to talk of independence only after it has entirely abolished its own evil customs, ennobled its own character and attained the same qualifications as any other powerful rising nation. Neither the evolution theory nor any modern advanced

thought admits that the evils consequent on the Hindu Caste System and religious superstition should have a place in any civilised nation".<sup>115</sup> This statement of the Japanese Statesman was taken up seriously by the Indians. Ramananda Chatterjee, one of the leading personalities of India, disapproved of the suggestions. However, he welcomed the Japanese statesman's advice in as much as it was a reminder of India's short-comings.<sup>116</sup>

Growing ties of friendship between India and Japan were strengthened more when the Japanese speaker in the Japanese House of Peers declared that it was the sacred duty of Japan, as the leading Asiatic State, to stretch a helping hand to Indians to free them from European yoke.<sup>117</sup> Lancelot Lawton, a contemporary European Writer, found Japanese sympathy to the national aspirations of India and pointed out that prominent space was given to the Indian matters in the Japanese newspapers.<sup>118</sup> Besides giving moral support to the Indian nationalists, the Japanese gave material help to the famine affected people of Bihar. An Indian Journal expressed a sense of gratitude to Japan for her help to the famine-stricken people of Bihar.<sup>119</sup>

The Japanese Press took up the cause of India's freedom. In an article entitled "The Nationalist Party in India", the Japanese Chronicle, an English Daily of Tokyo, supported the Congress's demand for Swaraj. The paper criticised the Britishers for their pretention that the Indians were not fit for self government and pleaded that a nation could not learn the use of liberty except by using liberty. Championing India's case for independence the paper expressed dismay at the British attitude that the Indians could not be given self rule as they were heterogeneous combinations of races, creeds and religions. The Japanese paper further supported the Indians in their demand for independence and observed that even a divided nation would function in unity when it would realise that unity was essential for its existence.<sup>120</sup> Another Japanese statesman, Baron Elichi Shibusawa, insisted on the need of close collaboration between India and Japan.<sup>121</sup> The Japanese Weekly Mail in an article under the caption "The Decline und Fall of the British Empire" advised England to learn lessons from the Russo-Japanese War and assured the Indians of the down fall of the British Empire in India.<sup>122</sup>

To help the Indians in their total boycott of foreign goods the Japanese gave encouragement to Indian traders and many new factories and mills with the aid of Japanese machines were started and the few existing ones strengthened. The Indian mills used the spindles manufactured in Japan<sup>123</sup> and Japan supplied experts to keep the Swadeshi industries alive.<sup>124</sup> A good number of Indian students went to Japan for industrial, agricultural and technical studies. Commenting upon the inflow of Indian students in Japan, the Japan Weekly Mail declared that this was the manifestation of the great trust India reposes in Japan.<sup>125</sup> The paper further hoped that the Indian youngmen on their return would not only render invaluable service to the Indian arts and industries but also add their mite in the true political, social and moral advancement of their countrymen.<sup>126</sup>

These sympathetic attitudes of the Japanese towards the Indians indicated that Japan was interested in Indian struggle for freedom. In spite of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, some of the Statesmen of Japan gave open encouragement to the Indians in their movement for independence which led some Indians to think of actual

assistance of Japan in their fight for freedom. "At present", wrote one Raoji I Amin, an Indian, in an English Daily from Tokyo, "India awaits the help of an Oriental nation (Japan) which has already been a success in civilisation and by its virtue has taught a good lesson to the countries of the West".<sup>127</sup>

Japan's sympathetic attitude towards the Indian National Movement created a wave of anxiety in the official circle of the British Indian Government Lord Curzon was so much perturbed at the growing intimacy between Japan and India that he refused to see Japanese Consul in India who had gone a long way to Simla to express sympathy on behalf of his Government over India's sufferings in the earthquake. *The Hitavadi*, an Indian Journal, explaining the reasons for Curzon's refusal to see the Japanese Consul pointed out that Lord Curzon was afraid of Japan's coming closer to India and that the Indian National Movement might be accentuated by this growing intimacy between these two Asiatic peoples.<sup>128</sup>

Of course, it was futile to hope that Japan would give aid to the Indian nationalists in their struggle against the British with whom Japanese had concluded a mutual alliance in 1902. However, no sober student of history could deny the genuine sympathy Japanese had for the Indians. The Indian revolutionaries expelled from India on account of seditious activities often found refuge in Japan and the revolutionaries were not asked to leave Japan until pressed by the British envoy.<sup>129</sup> In some cases, even this demand was not granted. Rash Bihari Bose, an Indian revolutionary, came to Japan when Shigenobu Ohkuma was in office. The British authorities, who were aware of the activities of Rash Bihari Bose, made a demand for his arrest and surrender Bose appealed to Toyama for help and protection which was unhesitatingly granted to him by Mitsuru Toyama.<sup>130</sup> Valentine Chirol, who was well versed in Asian developments, also pointed out that the emergence of Japan created so powerful an impression in India that one was not surprised to find the Indian revolutionaries looking in that quarter (Japan) for guidance and even, perhaps, for assistance.<sup>131</sup>

Mutual understanding between India and Japan developed to such a height that some of the Indian leaders and newspapers advocated a federation of the Asiatic people under the leadership of Japan. An Indian daily, "Kal", suggested a "Confederacy of Asiatic nations under the leadership of Japan".<sup>182</sup> Lala Lajpat Rai also observed : "the East must imbibe something of the aggressive spirit of the West if she wants to regain her self-respect, goes without saying. I want to establish that even at the present moment there is a fundamental unity between India, China, and Japan and that the Western influences over these countries have not yet advanced sufficiently far to destroy that unity".<sup>133</sup>

Thus, Japan's victory over Russia gave an impetus to the Indian nationalist movement and stirred up a new consciousness among the Indian leaders who began to assert the inherent unity of Asia and to dream of an Asiatic federation. A sense of fellow-feeling with Asian nations took a deep root in the Indian thinking and Asianism became a part of the nationalist philosophy in India. In other words, in India the stage was set for the development of a Pan-Asiatic movement led by the greatly admired Japan.<sup>134</sup>

India's sympathy was not confined to Japan only. Nationalist India also looked to other parts of the Asian continent and expressed its sympathy with those suffer-

ing under the yoke of Western exploitation. The country which attracted India's attention was China which was subjected to injurious trade relations. Opium trade had been imposed on the unwilling Chinese people resulting in imbalance in Chinese import-export trade and many social evils. Indians were shocked to see this inhuman opium trade with China. Gopal Krishna Gokhale in his budget speech in the Imperial Legislative Council on March 27, 1907, condemned the opium trade with China and the social evils that the trade produced in China. Expressing his resentment over export of opium to China Gokhale observed : "I confess I have always felt a sense of deep humiliation at the thought of this revenue, derived as it is practically from the degradation and moral ruin of the people of China. So far as the opium revenue is concerned, whatever may be the measure of England's responsibility in forcing the drug on China, the financial gain from the traffic has been derived by India alone, and we must, therefore be prepared to give up this unholy gain".<sup>135</sup> Actually, the public in India welcomed the loss which the Chinese awakening to stop the opium trade had caused to the Indian finances.<sup>136</sup> This sacrifice of the Indian leaders for the upliftment of China symbolised India's sympathy with the Chinese people. India looked to the Chinese Revolution of 1911 with a sympathetic eye and Sun Yat Sen, the leader of the Chinese Revolution, remained for long the hero of Indian nationalists.<sup>137</sup>

Indians were so sincerely interested in the affairs of the Asian nations that every sight of weakening of British imperialism was followed with eager hopefulness. The struggle of Egypt against British domination and the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 aroused passionate sympathy in India. Indian nationalists expressed their grave concern over the Anglo-Russian plan to partition Persia into their spheres of influence.<sup>138</sup> The grant of parliamentary constitution in Persia in 1907, and the national movements in Persia and Turkey exercised their influence upon Young Muslim minds in India and encouraged the Indian Muslims to stand against the authoritarian regime at home.<sup>139</sup> Maulana Abul Kalam Azad admitted that he was highly impressed by the Young Turk Movement and was inspired by it to co-operate with the work of political liberation of India.<sup>140</sup> Development in Persia and Russian policy in that country became a subject matter of regular discussion among the Indian Muslims in particular and the Indians in general. A mass meeting of Mohammedans held at Nehalpur in the sub-division of Basir-hat, district 24 Paraganas, on December 23, 1911, expressed deep regret at the acquiescence, of Great Britain in the Russian demands in Persia and criticised the conduct of Russia in Persia.<sup>141</sup> Early in 1912 Russia, at that time a friend of Britain, perpetuated massacres in Persia. The event shocked the Muslims and created resentment against the attitude of the British Government. Golan Hussain moved a resolution in the meeting of the All India Muslim League held on March 4, 1912 expressing the League's sympathy with the people of Persia urged upon the British Government to get Russia to adhere to the spirit of the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907.<sup>142</sup> Mazhar-ul-Haq raised the issue of Persia in 1912 from the Congress platform. He pointed out that the sacrilege committed by the Russian troops on the sacred mausoleum of Imam Moosi Raza at Meshed in Persia had exasperated the religious feelings of Muslims and criticised Sir Edward Grey, the author of Anglo-Russian Convention, for his indifferent attitude towards this outrage.<sup>143</sup> At its session in

1913 the Congress expressed its grief over the subversion of the Ottoman power in Europe and the strangling of Persia.<sup>144</sup> The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* in its editorial expressed sympathy with Persia.<sup>145</sup>

By and large, Indian Muslims did not have an organised, well-planned and well-thought outlook on international problems in the first few years of the 20th century. There was an apparent absence of foreign orientation in the Muslims of India. But against this general lack of a foreign affairs orientation, however, must be noted the fact of the historical sympathy and interest of the Muslims of India for other Muslim countries of West Asia and North Africa.<sup>146</sup> Indian Muslims opened their lips whenever they saw that their co-religionists in the countries of West Asia were under troubles because they had sentimental and cultural affinity with the Muslims of these countries. Indian Muslims were loyal to the Sultan of Turkey who was the religious and spiritual head of the Muslims of the world.

Indian Muslims also came under the influence of the Pan-Islamic movement. When Abdul Hamid II started the construction of the Hedjaz Railway all the Muslim nations contributed towards the railway construction fund. Hans Kohn wrote: "Events in one part of the Mohammedan world found an echo in far distant parts. Mohammedans of all lands, especially India, contributed to the building of the Hedjaz Railway".<sup>147</sup>

Pan-Islamic feelings deepened in India in the first quarter of the 20th century so much so that two Muslim gentlemen, namely Shaikh Abdur Qadir of Lahore and Sheikh Mushir Husain Kidwai of Gadia, visited Constantinople in 1906 and received special recognition and decoration from the Sultan of Turkey. After their return to India they spared no labour to promote Pan-Islamic activities.<sup>148</sup> Indian Muslims came under the spell of Pan-Islamic movement to such an extent that in, May, 1906 Minto wrote to Morley, "There is, as you no, doubt know, a Pan-Islamic movement working in India in no friendly sense towards our rule, and even in present circumstance it will probably make itself felt".<sup>149</sup>

One of the important factors which had made the Indian Muslims loyal to the British Rule was that the latter was at friendly terms with Muslim states, especially Turkey. The deterioration in the relations between England and Turkey in the beginning of the 20th century was anxiously watched by the Indian Muslims. Indian Muslims, who had always felt alarmed at the anti-Turkish policy of the Liberal Party of England, became sore over the return of the Liberal Party in power in 1905.<sup>150</sup> Muslims in India began to review and reconsider their duty in case Great Britain and Turkey were interlocked in a war. Mian Fazl-i-Husain, who was a barrister of the Lahore High Court and a member of Viceroy's Council from 1930-35, representing the opinion of the dominant section of the Muslims in India, emphatically stated that in case of a war between England and Turkey, 95 per cent of the followers of Islam in India would repudiate their allegiance to the British Crown.<sup>151</sup> There was, however, another section of Muslims in India which refuted the claim of Fazl-i-Husain. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, who aimed at creating an Anglo-Muslim entente, declared that the Khalifa was in no way the ruler of the Muslims. Beyond doubt, the Indian Muslims were full of sympathy and reverence for the Sultan of Turkey and wished for the longevity of the Turkish Empire, but being the subjects of the King-Emperor, the Muslims of India, Mohsin-ul-Mulk/

pointed out, owed their allegiance to the king alone. He further prayed for friendly relations between Turkey and Britain and observed, "If God forbid, there be a war between our Government and any Mohammedan power we should, as loyal subjects be, on the side of our own government, but as Mohammedans, we should also be sad about it".<sup>152</sup>

The year 1911 marked a turning point in the Pan-Islamic movement in India and gave a new orientation to the Indian attempts for Asian Solidarity. Frustrated and annoyed at the revocation of the partition of Bengal in 1911, the Indian Muslim were doubly shocked to hear the news of Italo-Turkish War. In 1911 Italy seized Tripolitana, then part of the Turkish Empire. Great Britain remained neutral in this war. The news that a Christian power was at war with the Caliphate aroused first among the middle-class Indian Muslims sympathy and concern for the safety of Turkey. The war produced a good deal of agitation among the Muslims in India who desired that Great Britain, which contained millions of Muslims as its subjects, should support Turkey against Italy. Hence, the British policy to remain neutral during the war caused a stir among the Indian Muslims who became anti-British in their outlook. To show their resentment over the British attitude towards the Italo-Turkish war and to express their sympathy with the Turkish people. Muslims in India held meetings, passed resolutions and prayed to God. The resentment against the unprovoked Italian invasion of Tripoli was universal and brought forth a considerable amount of explosive literature and created an awareness of the international situation among Muslims in India.<sup>153</sup> It was the U.P. Government which first of all brought to the notice of the Government of India the effects of the Italo-Turkish war on the Indian Muslims. On getting information from the U.P. Government, the Government of India directed the local governments of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, Punjab, Central Provinces and North West Frontier Province to assess the depth of anti-British sentiments caused among the Muslims by the Italo-Turkish War.<sup>154</sup> Various Muslim Organisations appealed to the Government of India to intervene in the War but the British Government declared to remain neutral. Thereupon, anti-British wave swept away the Muslims who began to think that there existed a secret Christian coalition, with which Britain was also associated, to overthrow Muslim powers all over the world.<sup>155</sup> An emergent meeting of the Council of the All India Muslim League held at Lucknow on October 7, 1911, passed resolutions sympathising with the Turkish people. The Council of the League placed on record its deep abhorrence of Italy's unjustifiable and high-handed action in Tripoli and sympathised with Turkey in her undeserved troubles and admired her magnanimity and dignified attitude throughout the crisis and appealed to the British Government to exercise its great influence as the greatest Muslim power and traditional ally of Turkey in the cause of peace to put an end to an unjust war. The Council of the League further advised the Mussalmans in India to keep a dignified attitude and place implicit confidence in the benevolence and good intentions of the British Government. The Council appealed to the Muslims to raise subscriptions for the relief of the sufferers in the war and urged the Muslims throughout the country to boycott Italian goods<sup>156</sup> of which a list was published as "*means of retaliation*".<sup>157</sup>

Numerous meetings were held all over India to express sympathy with Turkey.

On October 7, 1911 the Muslims of Detadi, district Aligarh, prayed to God for Turk's victory over Italy and expressed their sincere feelings against the unjust and hateful aggression of Italy and hoped that the British Government would prevent the progress of the conflict in the interest of Islam and the Muslim Community.<sup>158</sup> A mass meeting was held at Kanpur on November 3, 1911, to protest against Italy's actions in Tripoli and to ask the British Government to interfere and save the Turks from injury.<sup>159</sup>

Muslims of Bihar held several meetings to collect money for the Red Crescent Society but they could not collect large amount. However, they all felt that more active measures should have been made to save Turkey.<sup>160</sup> At a meeting held in Bihar the Italian invasion of Tripoli was strongly condemned and the Muslims present in the meeting took a vow to boycott Italian goods, to raise subscriptions for the Turkish sufferers and to co-operate with the Red Crescent Society to do relief work in Turkey.<sup>161</sup>

In Punjab the Muslims were very anxious about the fate of Turkey. The Punjab Muslims believed that England was in league with other European powers in destroying Turkey.<sup>162</sup> The Muslim feeling ran so high in Punjab that widespread resentment against the Government was apprehended and it was therefore that the Punjab Government wanted an early termination of the war without causing much humiliation to Turkey.<sup>163</sup> Meetings were organised in the province to express sympathy with Turkey. A mass meeting of the Mohammedans held at Lahore expressed its indignation at Italy's high-handed action in Tripoli and promised its solidarity with Turkey. The meeting also urged upon the Muslims of India to boycott Italian goods.<sup>164</sup>

The Muslims in Madras also expressed their sympathy with the Turks.<sup>165</sup> In this province some Muslims were moved so much by the tragic tale of Tripoli that they adopted retaliatory methods and indulged in physical assaults of the Christians. A disturbance took place in Changnachery in Travencore State when some Muslims apparently got out of hand after reading about the Italo-Turkish War in a local vernacular newspaper and assaulted a number of Christians.<sup>166</sup>

There was a widespread pro-Turkish feeling in the Muslim Community of Bombay. The Muslims in Bombay Presidency held several meetings to collect fund for the Red Crescent Society and made several representations to the Government against Italian atrocities in Tripoli. The province was visited by the emissaries from Turkey, Egypt and Persia who urged the Muslims to support Turkey and convinced the Bombay Muslims of British connivance with Italian atrocities in Tripoli. The papers like *Al-Hilal*, *Zamindar*, *Watan*, *Paisa Akhbar*, *Vakil* did a lot to arouse Muslim feeling in Bombay.<sup>167</sup>

In Bengal, the Muslims felt alarmed at the Italian activities in Tripoli and expressed their sympathy with Turkey and criticised British Government for her neutrality in the War. Numerous meetings were held all over Bengal to sympathise with the Turks. A branch of the Red Crescent Society was established and large amount of subscriptions was raised to help the Turks in their hours of trouble.<sup>168</sup> A largely attended mass meeting of the Mohammedans of Basirhat sub-division in Bengal expressed sympathy with the Turks engaged in war with Italy and urged upon the Muslims to boycott Italian goods and expressed sympathy for the woun-

ded and killed on the side of Turkey. About sixty rupees were collected on the spot for the relief work in Turkey. The Mussalmans of Mymensingh also expressed their heartfelt sympathy with the Turkish people.<sup>169</sup> Nearly three thousand Muslims, including leaders like Dr. Suhrawardy, Cossim Ariff and Haji Ahmad, attended a meeting at Calcutta to express sympathy with Turkey and to condemn Italian action in Tripoli.<sup>170</sup> On December 23, 1911, a mass meeting of the Muslims was held at Nehalpur, a village in the sub-division of Basirhat, district 24 Paraganas, and resolutions protesting against Italian atrocities in Tripoli and expressing sympathy with the Sultan on account of the unjust attack of Italy on Tripoli were adopted. The sympathy for the Turkish dead and wounded had become so deep that spontaneous contributions to the relief fund came forth from all sides when the meeting dispersed. Forty-eight rupees were contributed by the poor Muslims for the relief fund.<sup>171</sup>

The Muslim newspapers and pamphlets raised hue and cry over Italian invasion of Tripoli and aroused the sentiments of the Indian Muslims in favour of the Turkish people and Sultan. Important Muslim periodicals in India, notably *Al-Hilal Comrade*, *Zamindar*, *Hamdard*, and the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, supported the Turkish cause and argued for Muslim unity and solidarity.<sup>172</sup> Muhammad Iqbal, the great Muslim Poet-Philosopher of India, also lent his voice to the protest, reading a poem dedicated to the Turkish struggle in Tripoli in the mosques of India.<sup>173</sup> The Punjab Government held the *Zamindar*, *Vakil* and *Al-Muin* responsible for propagating Pan-Islamic sentiments in Punjab.<sup>174</sup> The *Zamindar* became so much popular with the Muslims that it was converted from a weekly into a daily, and its circulation went up in a large number. For its bitter attacks on Christian nations the Government considered the "*Zamindar*" as the most dangerous from the political point of view.<sup>175</sup> The *Comrade*, *Zamindar*, *Paisa Akhbar*, *Vakil*, *Al-Hilal* were widely read by the people. A Benaras Pamphlet entitled *Ur-in-Najaf* in its February issue of 1912 appealed to the Muslims to raise a handsome amount to help the Turkish people and told the Muslims not to buy the goods produced in the Christian nations and to give money to the Government for the manufacture of arms to be used against their co-religionists. This pamphlet urged the Muslims to unite against the concerted assault of the West on Islam and Turkey.<sup>176</sup> The "*Comrade*" and many other Muslim papers published special war news and they were in so much demand by the people that the "*Nama-i-Maqaddas Habl-ul-Matin*" turned from a weekly into a daily. The news flashed by these journals influenced both the educated and the general mass.<sup>177</sup> The "*Hablul-Matin*" made a passionate appeal to the Muslims to forge a united front to meet European Challenge and asked the Government of India to put an end to Italian atrocities in Tripoli.<sup>178</sup> Pro-Turkish feelings became so deep rooted in the Indian Muslim's minds that the Muslim Press warned England of the dire consequences, if she did not change her policy towards Turkey. The *Mohammadi* adopted an openly anti-European and anti-British attitude during the Italo-Turkish War and advocated boycott of Italian goods. The paper, which was famous for its Pan-Islamic leanings, received an impetus in its leanings from the war and from supposed British connivance with Italy in her atrocities in Turkey.<sup>179</sup> Another Muslim Journal entitled "*Islam Rabi*" asked the government to withdraw its notification of neutrality and allow the

Muslims to show their sympathy and love for Turkey.<sup>180</sup>

What to say of the Muslims and their press, even the Hindu Press sympathised with Turkey. But the Hindu Press adopted a moderate view. "The Tribune" denounced the Italian action in Tripoli but also deprecated the indifference of the Indian Muslims from the affairs of their own country and advised the Muslims not to boycott Italian goods. Another Hindu paper, the *Punjabee*, ridiculed the Muslims for their loyalty to the British Raj which was a fair whether friend likely to desert the Muslims after making use of them.<sup>181</sup> Of course, the Hindu papers were sympathetic towards Turkey and admitted that the Indian Muslims had a just cause for anger but unlike the Muslim papers, they did not approve of the anti-government movement on this account and asked the Indian Muslims to desist from all agitation causing embarrassment to the Government.<sup>182</sup> The Hindu papers in the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam condemned the war and justified the stand taken by the Indian Muslims but advised the Muslims to desist from boycott of Italian goods.<sup>183</sup> "The Mahratta" criticised European neutrality in face of naked aggression of Italy in Turkey. The "Political Bhomiyo" made scathing attack on the alleged conspiracy of the European powers to destroy Islam. "The Indian Social Reformer" held the view that Europeans were sympathetic to the constitutional democratic movements in Asian countries because they wanted to promote their selfish interests by fostering confusion in these countries.<sup>184</sup>

The various meetings held and numerous resolutions passed at those meetings symbolised the deep sorrow of the Indian Muslims over Italian invasion of Tripoli and the British policy of neutrality. These actions of the Indian Muslims also reflected the profound sympathy for Turkey and the deep rooted Pan-Islamic tendencies in the Indian Muslims. In fact, the Italo-Turkish war resulted in an organised and sustained Pro-Turkish movement and accentuated the Pan-Islamic tendency of the Indian Muslims.<sup>185</sup> Whereas Pro-Turkish feeling in Indian Muslims was to a degree the result of the Pan-Islamic sentiments, the sympathy expressed by Hindus and their newspapers for Turkey were the by-products of the Pan-Asiatic tendency which was developing in India. To the Hindus, Turkey represented an Asiatic power and hence they expressed their solidarity with the Turks who were inter-locked in a war with a European power.

The years 1912 and 1913 gave a boost to the Pan-Islamic movement in India. Hardly the wounds of the Italian invasion had cured that Turkey was stormed by another crisis of magnitudes. Montenegro, Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia attacked Turkey. The war popularly known as the First Balkan war started in October, 1912 and continued upto May, 1913 and resulted in defeat and loss of territory to Turkey. The Turks would have been driven completely out of Europe had not the victors quarrelled among themselves over the spoils. Bulgaria, which had contributed most to the defeat of Turkey, wanted all Macedonia, a demand which did not please her allies who attacked Bulgaria and found willing helpers in the Turks. In this second Balkan war (June July, 1913) fought by Bulgaria against Greece, Serbia, Rumania and Turkey, the Turks recovered Adrianople.<sup>185a</sup> Great Britain adopted a neutral policy throughout the war, despite the repeated requests made by the Indian Muslims to intervene in the interest of Turkey. The neutral stand of Great Britain caused resentment against the British Rule and widened the scope of Pan-Islamism

in India. The Balkan wars caused widespread anxiety among the Indian Muslims as regards the British and convinced the Muslims of the Machiavellian trait in British diplomacy and they were led to feel that the British professions of friendship were insincere.<sup>186</sup> The Conquest of Morocco by France, the seizure of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria, the Italian invasion on Tripoli and the Balkan wars compelled the Indian Muslims to think that there was a sinister conspiracy amongst the Western Countries to swallow up Turkish integrity. Indian Muslims began to think that the Christian powers of Europe were determined to destroy the Ottoman Empire and the Caliphate, the last vestige of the past Islamic glory. The fate of Turkey especially excited the Indian Muslims and stimulated anti-European feelings<sup>187</sup> in their hearts. The progress of the unfortunate events in Balkan states was anxiously watched by those sections of the community which were ordinarily unmoved by political events.<sup>188</sup> The Muslims of North India eagerly watched the every move in the game in the Balkans and every reference to the subjects made by British politicians.<sup>189</sup> In fact, the Balkan wars produced intense reaction among the Indian Muslims, especially in articulate section of the Muslim Community.<sup>190</sup> The dismemberment of Turkey evoked widespread regret in which some non-Muslims also shared; the fate of Muslim states and the treatment meted out to them by Europe made the deepest and most painful impression on every mind.<sup>191</sup> The war came to be regarded as "the ultimatum of Europe's temporal aggression"<sup>192</sup> and created an atmosphere of restlessness in the Indian Muslims. The longdreaded trouble in the Balkans – "a life and death struggle between the leading Asiatic power and four minor kingdoms of Eastern Europe",<sup>193</sup> excited the Indian Muslims who held several meetings in the various parts of India and passed resolutions denouncing the Balkan States and prayed for the speedy recovery of the Porte.<sup>194</sup> "The Balkan Wars" wrote Jawahar Lal Nehru, "roused an astonishing wave of sympathy in the Muslims of India and all Indians felt that anxiety and sympathy".<sup>195</sup>

Muslims in Bihar and Orissa expressed their sympathy with the Turks and held meetings at Patna, Ranchi, Hazaribagh, Chapra and other important towns to raise subscriptions for the Turkish aid fund. Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haq in a meeting held at Bankipore on July 13, 1913 delivered an extremely inflammatory speech.<sup>196</sup> In the United Provinces the Muslim sympathy for Turkey was very widespread. On December 13, 1912 in a meeting held at Lucknow, the Aga Khan appealed to the audience to contribute to the funds opened in the aid of Turkey and he himself contributed one thousand rupees.<sup>197</sup> Sympathy for Turkey had become so deep rooted that even the Muslim students of M.A.O. College, Aligarh effected savings by curtailing their diet in order to send money to the Turks.<sup>198</sup> A society of the "Servants of Caaba" was established in Lucknow in 1913 to protect the interests of Islam throughout the world and particularly to protect the Holy cities of Islam from falling into the hands of the non-Islamic powers.<sup>199</sup> Its secretary, Shaukat Ali, also planned to send volunteers to fight on the side of Turkey.<sup>200</sup> Pro-Turkish and the anti-Christian feeling ran so high in the United Province that a number of tombstones and crosses at the Christian cemetery at Moradabad were damaged.<sup>201</sup> The agitation in favour of Turkey and against the British reached such a height that the situation in U.P. seemed to be thoroughly unsatisfactory to the authorities.<sup>202</sup>

The Muslims in Bengal were much ahead than their counterparts in other pro-

vinces in their sympathy with the Turks. The British Government was severely condemned for her pro-Balkan League attitude. Some newspapers, particularly "al-Hilal," reminded the Muslims of their religious duties towards the Caliph. Sometimes even Jihad was preached.<sup>203</sup> Numerous mass meetings in support of Turkey were held and collections were made to help the Turkish people and at these meetings the speakers emphasised that the war was a struggle between Cross and Crescent.<sup>204</sup> In Calcutta alone, Muslims organised several mass meetings where anti-Turkish attitude to the British was criticised and resolutions expressing solidarity with Turkey were passed.<sup>205</sup> Anti-British feeling became so deep in the Muslims of Bengal that the more advanced sections of the Muslim Community advocated a Hindu-Muslim coalition and championed the cause of the Hindu Congress party.<sup>206</sup> It was apprehended by the Government that the Balkan War would bring the Young Muslim party closer to the Congress.<sup>207</sup>

Pro-Turkish and anti-British feeling was not so high in Madras<sup>208</sup> and in the Central Provinces,<sup>209</sup> as in other Provinces. Nevertheless the Muslims were sympathetic to the Turkish people. The Balkan war created a stir among the Punjab Muslims. The journalists, lawyers, teachers and literateurs condemned the anti-Turkish attitude of the European powers and showed their concern over the satisfaction expressed by the British ministers on the success of the Balkan allies.<sup>210</sup> In the North West Frontier Province the Pro-Turkish feeling was very feeble and sympathy for Turkey was expressed by a small section of educated men who were in close touch with the Muslim League and with Mohammed Ali and Zafar Ali, the editors of *Comrade* and *Zamindar* respectively.<sup>211</sup> The Muslims of the Bombay province were deeply shocked to learn the British hostile attitude towards Turkey and made generous contribution to the Turkish aid fund.<sup>212</sup> A public meeting of the Muslims of Bombay held under the presidentship of Currimbhoy Ebrahim and passed resolutions sympathising with Turkey.<sup>213</sup> Prayers were offered at Lahore for the victory of the Turkish arms and subscriptions were raised in aid of Turkish Relief Fund. A Muslim bank, namely Orient Bank of India proposed to sell its shares amounting to two crore rupees to the public and give the amount realised as a loan to the Turkish Government.<sup>214</sup>

Pro-Turkish and anti-British moves reached the climax in 1912 when a Medical Mission organised under Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari was sent to Turkey as a token of Indian Muslim's solidarity with Turkey. Maulana Mohammed Ali collected necessary money for the despatch of the mission to render valuable service to the suffering Turks. Indian Muslims had so deep sympathy for Turkey that even the poor subscribed to the funds of the Medical Mission.<sup>215</sup> Muslim writers and poets, Journals and Press and Muslim religious and political leaders expressed their unanimous sympathy for the Turks. Muslim Journals like the *Comrade* and the *Zamindar* strongly supported Turkey against her European adversaries and openly preached Pan-Islamism. Zafar Ali Khan, the editor of the *Zamindar*, collected money for the Turkish Red Crescent Society and proceeded to Constantinople to present the money to the Grand Vizier. For the inflammatory tone of its articles the security of his paper was confiscated by the government.<sup>216</sup> Mohammed Ali denounced the anti-Turkish policy of the British and preached the gospel of Pan-Islamism.<sup>217</sup> Indian Muslim's passionate sympathy for Turkey could be gleaned

from the fact that when the Bulgars reached near the city of Constantinople, Mohammed Ali, out of his helplessness and utter frustration at the sight of the misfortune of Islam and Turkey, thought of committing suicide.<sup>218</sup>

Anti-British feeling became such a common feature with the Indian Muslims that they lost their faith in the sincerity of the government. The British Prime Minister Lord Asquith's speech at the Guildhall banquet on November 9, 1912 in which he predicted the early fall of Turkey was bitterly criticised by the Muslim Press in India.<sup>219</sup> All the British politicians, who welcomed the success of the Balkan states, were denounced<sup>220</sup> and the statement of Lord Asquith affected the Indian Muslims profoundly. Lord Hardinge was "bombarded with telegrams of protests,"<sup>221</sup> and he was disturbed that the young Muslims were getting out of hands<sup>222</sup> and were creating a separatist tendency away from Aligarh in the minds of the moderate Muslims.<sup>223</sup> What to speak of the condemnation of the British officials, even Aga Khan's counsel of moderation published in *Times of India* on February 14, 1913 and his advice to the Muslims to bring England and Turkey closer through their loyal efforts were condemned and rejected by the young Muslims who rebuked the Aga Khan as an enemy of Islam and a slave of the British.<sup>224</sup> Maulana Azad criticised the pro-British attitude of some of the leaders of the Aligarh school and referred to them as those heretics and hypocrites who, during the last forty years, had co-operated with the satans of Europe to weaken the influence of Islamic Caliphate and Pan-Islam.<sup>225</sup> Some extremists among the Muslims advocated boycott of European goods. Leakat Hussain, a prominent Muslim leader of Calcutta, and the few other Muslim leaders of Calcutta and the few Muslim papers like *Muhammadi* and *Al-Hilal* also urged the Muslims to boycott European goods.<sup>226</sup> Timely action by the Government and the lack of organisation among the Muslims stood in the way of the successful boycott.<sup>227</sup> Some Muslims attempted to raise loans on the security of the Turkish bonds issued by the Ottoman Treasury. Mohammed Ali supported this move,<sup>228</sup> but the Government of India opposed it and dissuaded Indian ruling chiefs from accepting these bonds, for, in its opinion, there was no adequate security for the payment of money raised through them.<sup>229</sup>

Indian Muslims were assisted in their sympathy for Turkey by their Hindu brethren. Whereas the Muslims were actuated by Pan-Islamic ideas in their support and sympathy for Turkey, the Hindus in India supported the Turks because they were Asiatics. To the Hindus, the Balkan War was a struggle between an Asiatic country and European nations. Indian nationalist leaders expressed their sympathy for Turkey because she was an Asiatic power. A public meeting of the Hindus and Muslims was held at Calcutta, on November 3, 1912 to express solidarity with Turkey. Although it was a crowded meeting the Mohammedans were not largely represented. Bipin Chandra Pal presided over the meeting. Leakat Hussain addressing the meeting urged the boycott of European goods and made a fervent appeal for funds in aid of sufferers in Turkey. Dr. Abdul Gafoor, another speaker, declared that the Balkan War had threatened Islam in Europe and the duty of Muslims did not end in merely sending money to the Red Crescent Society. "The duty of the Mohammedans in Bengal, nay, the whole of India," Dr. Gafoor pointed out, "consisted in strengthening Turkey and weakening their enemies and that could only be done by boycotting European goods." Speaking on the occasion Babu Shyam

Sunder Chakravarty observed that "the decline of the political ascendancy of Turkey meant the destruction of an ancient culture and civilisation." He, however, hoped that the results of the war would have great effects on "*Asian solidarity*" and emphasised the necessity of unity between Hindus and Muslims in India. This disaster of Turkey, he emphatically stated, "would go a long way in making a solidarity among the different nations of Asia."<sup>230</sup> Bipin Chandra Pal in his presidential address declared that the meeting was a call from the Indian nationalism for Turkish nationalism and made an appeal for raising funds to help the Turks.<sup>231</sup> Hindus' support for Turkey caused a concern to the government and Hardinge in his letter to Crew informed that in Bengal Hindu "agitators" intervened "to provoke and foment Mohammedan resentment" against the British.<sup>232</sup>

The Indian National Congress also shared the sorrows of the Muslim brethren in India and expressed its concern over the fate of Turkey and emphasised the need for the peaceful settlement of the disputes. Mazhar-ul-Haq, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the twenty-seventh session of the Indian National Congress, declared that the Balkan war was not a war against the Turks but a war to turn Muslims out of Europe, a war between the Cross and Crescent and a war between the Asiatics and the Europeans.<sup>233</sup> He further criticised the British policy of indifference to the Muslim cause and pointed out that this attitude for the British ministers had deeply offended the sentiments of the seventy millions of Mussalmans of India.<sup>234</sup> Rao Bahadur R.N. Mudholkar, the president of the twenty-seventh session of the Indian National Congress, expressed profound sorrow and sympathy which the Hindus and all non-Muslim Indians felt for their Muslim brethren in the great misfortune that had overtaken the Caliphate and added that as a subject of Great Britain which was neutral in the war, it was not proper for him to take sides between the belligerents but "as staunch believers in the supremacy of the moral law and upholders of the principle of peaceful evolution, this much I believe is permissible to us to say," declared the president, "that it is possible to satisfy the just and the legitimate aspirations of the Christian provinces of the Turkish Empire without destroying the existence or the importance of Turkey or subjecting her to the humiliating condition of powerlessness."<sup>235</sup> Nawab Syed Muhammad, the president of the twenty-eight session of the Indian National Congress, also pointed out that the disastrous results caused by the Balkan War had unnerved the Indian Muslims and the dismemberment of Turkey by depriving her of her European provinces had evoked widespread regret in which non-Muslims also shared. He further declared that the defeat of Turkey, while it had caused intense grief and depression to the Islamic world, had at the same time brought Muslims closer together in a way that nothing else was capable of doing.<sup>236</sup> The intense heat of Pan-Islamic tendency did not leave the Aga Khan unmoved. Even the Aga Khan wrote in 1914 :

"For more than two years past the Moslems of India, in common with their co-religionists in other countries, have been going through the most painful experience. The Turkish loss of sovereignty in Northern Africa and in the Balkans, the continued disintegration of Persia, the treatment of Indians in South Africa, and certain matters of Indian administration, have all deeply affected Indian Moslems. The Mohammedans of India, newly awakened to national

consciousness by the education England has given them, not limited in their gaze by the vast ramparts of the Himalayas or by the waters of the Indian Ocean. There is between them and their fellow-believers in other lands essential unity, which breaks through differences of the sect and country, for it is not based on religious grounds only . ... They share the glorious heritage not only of the Koran .. but of the history and philosophy of Arabia, the incomparable poetry of Persia, the romances and legends of Egypt and Morocco and Spain. Drinking from these imperishable springs, Moslems, whether Turks, Persians, Arabi, or Indians, and whether or not they have also come to the Western walls of knowledge, are bound together by a certain unity of thought, of sentiment, and of expression."<sup>237</sup>

Turkey also felt obliged for the immense sympathy and support expressed by the Indian Muslims. Early in 1914 Khalid Beg, the Turkish Consul-General, visited Lahore and presented to the Badshahi Mosque a carpet, sent by the Sultan of Turkey as token of his gratitude to the Muslims of India. Soon after two Turkish doctors of the Red Crescent Society visited Punjab and succeeded in pulling some Muslims to the Turkish side.<sup>238</sup>

In the beginning of 1914 it seemed that a war would break out in Europe. The Indian Muslims began to review their attitude in case of a war between Turkey and Britain. Mohammed Ali thought that in the event of a war between Britain and Turkey, he and his followers would have to take sides and that they would certainly support Turkey. When the First World War occurred and Britain declared war on Germany on August 4, 1914 the Muslims of India found themselves in a dilemma. On August 31, 1914 Mohammed Ali sent a wire to the Sultan of Turkey in which he urged the Sultan of Turkey either to support Britain or to keep neutral in this war.<sup>239</sup> Turkey joined Germany against Britain on November 4, 1914. The Muslims became puzzled and what to do was the problem before them. Mohammed Ali and his followers ranged themselves with Turkey against the British Raj. In May, 1915, Mohammed Ali and his brother Shaukat Ali were arrested for openly justifying Turkey's entry into the war against Britain and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was also placed under surveillance at Ranchi for his Pro-Turkish attitude.<sup>240</sup>

Even during the stormy days of the First World War some of the Indian nationalists did much to co-ordinate their freedom struggle with other Asian nations to get foreign assistance to wipe out the British Raj. Some of the Indian revolutionaries approached the German Government for arms and monetary assistance which was granted to them Raja Mahendra Pratap and Barakatullah along with Dr. Von Hentig, German Legation Secretary, came to Kabul and persuaded the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India. This mission, on its way to Kabul, was given grand reception in Turkey. Raja Mahendra Pratap addressed a meeting at Istanbul and the Sultan handed him a letter for the Amir of Afghanistan. Barakatullah also got a fatwa from Sheikh-ul-Islam asking the Indian Muslims to co-operate with the Hindus.<sup>241</sup> When the mission reached Afghanistan the members were lodged in quarters within Bahar Garden as the Amir of Afghanistan had promised Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy of India, that the aliens entering his kingdom would be disarmed and their activities would be restricted.<sup>242</sup> But the restrictions on the mission were lifted when the members of the mission went on hunger strike.<sup>243</sup>

While the Indian revolutionaries were making efforts to win over Afghanistan on the side of Nationalist India, some Muslim students left India in February, 1915<sup>244</sup> and proceeded to Kabul where they were detained but were released on the recommendation of Sardar Nasrullah Khan, the Afghan Amir's brother, and thereafter they came in touch with the Indian revolutionary leaders working in Afghanistan.<sup>245</sup> In August, 1915, Maulana Obeidullah Sindhi, a disciple of the Deoband School, proceeded to Afghanistan to ruin the British Government with the help of Afghanistan and became successful in enlisting support for India in Afghanistan. Obeidullah along with Mahendra Pratap, Muhammad Mian Ansari and Barkatullah held several meetings with the Amir of Afghanistan which resulted in the formation of the Provisional Government of India on December 1, 1915. Raja Mahendra Pratap became its President, Barkatullah was made Prime Minister and Obeidullah was appointed Home Minister so that when the British Government was ousted from India there would be no difficulty in taking over the administration.<sup>246</sup> This Provisional Government dealt directly with the Afghan Government and even a treaty was drawn up between the two. With the help of Sardar Nasrullah Khan, the Provisional Government organised an army of twelve hundred tribal youths for making India free.<sup>247</sup> The Afghan rulers Amir Habibullah Khan, and, to a greater extent, his successor Amamullah Khan, were secretly in sympathy with this Provisional Government of India.<sup>248</sup> Habibullah, though in sympathy with the programme of the Indian revolutionaries, maintained a neutral policy and was able to avoid any clash with the British.<sup>249</sup> This Provisional Government sent two missions, one to Japan and another to Turkey. Sheikh Abdul Kadir and Dr. Mathura Singh led the mission to Japan and Abdul Bari and Dr. Shujullah went on Turkish mission but the members of both the missions were arrested and the plan could not succeed.<sup>250</sup>

Shortly after Obeidullah left India for Kabul, Maulana Mahmud Hasan, the head Moulvi of the Deoband School, along with Mian Ansari and few others left for Hejaz to make a direct contact with the Turkish Government and to seek material help for the plan against the British Rule. During his stay at Hejaz Maulana Mahmud Hasan met the Turkish Minister of war, Anwar Pasha and General Jamal Pasha and told them about his revolutionary movement and asked them for help. At his request three documents in Arabic, Persian and Turkish signed by Anwar Pasha and Jamal Pasha were handed over to him. They had the same contents, expressed in different languages sympathising with the Indian demand for independence and promising help to it.<sup>251</sup> Mian Ansari proceeded with this document known as Ghalibnama—to Kabul and met Obeidullah there. Obeidullah wrote a long letter to Mahmud Hasan urging him to secure the active co-operation of the Turkish Government and of the Sheriff of Mecca, and describing the scheme of a Pan-Islamic army—the "Army of God"—with headquarters at Medina, and subordinate Commands at Constantinople, Tehran and Kabul. These letters were dated July 9, 1916 and were addressed to an agent in Sindh with instructions to forward by a reliable messenger to Mahmud Hasan. These letters were written on pieces of silk cloth and they were carried to India by a family servant of two students who had left Lahore and gone to Kabul. The servant met the father of the two boys with their news and the father handed over the letters to the British authorities,<sup>252</sup>

who got valuable information as to the sympathisers in India, interned about a dozen persons and took other necessary preventive steps. Thus, the Silk Letters Conspiracy, an attempt of the Indian revolutionaries to ruin the British Raj with the help of other Asian nations, came to a miserable end.<sup>253</sup>

Meanwhile Indian Muslims heard the news of the revolt of the Sheriff of Mecca against the Turkish Empire. The news caused considerable anxiety among the Muslims of India. Anxiety became more profound and vocal when it was known that the British were instrumental in bringing in this rebellion against the Turkish Empire. At first the news was not believed by the Muslims and Abdul Bari, the president of the Indian Pan-Islamists Organisation "Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba", who was a personal friend of the Grand Sheriff, disbelieved the news and with a view to verify it he proposed to send a deputation of Indian Muslims which was also to act as a peacemaker between the Arabs and the Turks but the proposal did not materialise.<sup>254</sup> Throughout India the Muslims condemned the action of the Sheriff. An emergent meeting of the Council of the All India Muslim League held at Lucknow on June 26, 1916 placed on record its deep abhorrence of the action of the Arab rebels headed by the Sheriff of Mecca and condemned them and their sympathisers as enemies of Islam.<sup>255</sup>

A public meeting was held at Lucknow on June 27, 1916 and a resolution disclaiming the report of the *Statesman*, an English owned-paper, that Indian Muslims welcomed the revolt was passed.<sup>256</sup> It was generally believed that Britain was responsible for the Sheriff's treachery and Muslims of Bombay and Calcutta disapproved of the actions of the Sheriff.<sup>257</sup> Mohammed Ali Jinnah warned the British Government not to interfere with the future of the Caliphate because this would lead to the dissatisfaction among the Muslims of India and reminded the British Government that "the loyalty of the Mussalmans of India to the Government is no small asset".<sup>258</sup>

Muslims of Delhi condemned the Sheriff for endangering the safety of the holy places by his action.<sup>259</sup> On July 6, 1916 a meeting was held under the presidency of Shamsul ulema Sayed Ahmad, who was considered to be most loyal to the British, and a resolution was passed expressing confidence that the British Government would keep to the very letter the promise with regard to the Holy Places held out to the Muslims at the beginning of the war.<sup>260</sup> The local unit of the Muslim League and the Central Mohammedan Association of Calcutta held meetings to express their views on the Arab revolt and the Muslim League passed a resolution condemning the Sheriff and his sympathisers.<sup>261</sup> At a meeting held at Dacca the Sheriff was condemned as a "traitor".<sup>262</sup> Muslim feelings in the North West Frontier Provinces and the neighbouring areas of Kanpur and Lucknow ran very high and the Government found indications of trouble in Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta.<sup>263</sup> In Lahore, a group of the Punjab Muslim League passed a resolution condemning the Sheriff's action<sup>264</sup> and the *Vakil*, *Kisan* and *Alsar* published articles condemning the Sheriff's revolt and also warned the British against lending aid to the Sheriff in maintaining his independence.<sup>265</sup> Abdul Bari, the president of the Anjuman-i-Khuddam i Kaaba sent a telegram to the Viceroy condemning the action of the Sheriff "the impudent besieger of the tomb of the Holy Prophet and his sympathisers" who were the "enemies of Islam".<sup>266</sup> The Nizam of Hyderabad and

the Begum of Bhopal refrained from expressing their resentment at the Sheriff's action but they also did not come out in support of the Sheriff's action.<sup>267</sup>

A study of the Indian National Movement and its attitude towards Asian people during 1900 and 1918 would reveal that India evinced considerable interest in Asian countries. Of course, the Indian nationalist leaders were awefully busy with their demands for self-government and their whole energy was mobilised to secure it. Nevertheless, they did not remain aloof from the currents of developments in the Asian continent. The Indian National Congress openly criticised the British expansionist policy in Asia and expressed sympathy with Asian countries in hours of distress. Nationalist India shared the pleasure of the achievements of Japan and the latter became a model for India. India's concern for Persia, China, Burma and other Asian countries indicated the growth of Asian consciousness. Indians in general and the Muslims of India in particular stood as one man against Italy and Balkan powers when they were interlocked in war with Turkey. Beyond doubt, Indian Muslims in their sympathy with Turkey were, to a considerable degree, working under the influence of Pan-Islamic ideas and religious sentiments. But to the Hindus and to the Indian National Congress Turkey was an Asiatic power and thus while championing the cause of Turkey they thought of championing the cause of Asia against Europe. In other words, in Indian atmosphere pan-Islamism was converted into Pan-Orientalism by the Indian nationalists. Thus, Asianism as a marked feature of Indian nationalist thinking had emerged during the years 1900-18.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>Surendra Nath Banerjee, *Speeches of Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee*, Vol. VI. (Calcutta, 1908) p. 327.
- <sup>2</sup>Gopal Krishna Gokhale, *Speeches of the Honourable G. K. Gokhale* (Madras, 1920) p. 915.
- <sup>3</sup>*Report of the Twenty-First Indian National Congress*, (1905), p. 13.
- <sup>4</sup>Lord Hardinge, *My Indian Years : Reminiscences*, (London, 1948), p. 115
- <sup>5</sup>Lady Minto, *India, Minto and Morley (1905-1910)*, (London, 1935), p. 298.
- <sup>6</sup>Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, *Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought* (Calcutta, 1958) pp. 63-123.
- <sup>7</sup>M.A. Buch, *Rise and Growth of Indian Militant Nationalism* p. 25.
- <sup>8</sup>Bal Gangadhar Tilak, *Two Remarkable Speeches* (Sylhet, 1907) p. 6.
- <sup>9</sup>Bal Gangadhar Tilak, *Writings and Speeches* (Madras, 1907) p. 56
- <sup>10</sup>W.T. de Bary, *Sources of Indian Tradition*, p. 722.
- <sup>11</sup>B.C. Pal, *Speeches Delivered at Madras* (Madras, 1907) p. 21.
- <sup>12</sup>Lajpat Rai, "The Coming Indian National Congress—Some Suggestions" *Koyastha Samachar*, November 1901, pp. 376-85.
- <sup>13</sup>Lajpat Rai, "The Principles of Political Congress", *East and West*, August, 1902, Vol. I. p. 1040.
- <sup>14</sup>*Punjab Native Newspaper Reports 1900-1921*, *Paisa Akbhar*, December 12 and 13, 1905.
- <sup>15</sup>*Report of the Sedition Committee, 1918*, Chapter 11.
- <sup>16</sup>Surendranath Banerjee, *A Nation in Making*, p. 187.
- <sup>17</sup>*Report of the Twenty Second Indian National Congress*, p. 83
- <sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 87-89.
- <sup>19</sup>N.C. Sen Gupta, "The Boycott Movement", *The Indian Review*, May, 1909, p. 351.
- <sup>20</sup>*Report of the Twenty Second Indian National Congress*, p. 83.
- <sup>21</sup>*The Bengalee*, December 7, 1907.
- <sup>22</sup>Aurobindo Ghose, *An Open Letter to His Countrymen*, p. 4.
- <sup>23</sup>C.Y. Chintamani, *Indian Politics Since the Mutiny* (London, 1940) p. 79.
- <sup>24</sup>S. Bhima Sankara Roy, *The 22nd Indian National Congress*, 1907, I.O.L. Tract, 1028.
- <sup>25</sup>Ambika Charan Majumdar, *Indian National Evolution*, pp. 108-24. See M.R. Jayakar, *The Story of My Life*, Vol. I (Bombay, 1958) p. 82.
- <sup>26</sup>N.V. Rajkumar, *Development of the Congress Constitution* (New Delhi, All India Congress Committee, 1949) pp. 14-15.
- <sup>27</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, p. 87.
- <sup>28</sup>R.S. Wasti, *Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement, 1905-1910*, (Oxford, 1964) p. 29.
- <sup>29</sup>Quoted in B.N. Pandey
- <sup>30</sup>H.G. Rawlison, in *The British Achievement in India* (London, 1948) pp. 185-86.
- <sup>31</sup>Lady Minto, *India, Minto and Morley*, p. 47.
- <sup>32</sup>Afzal Iqbal, (ed) *Select Writings and Speeches of Maulana Muhammad Ali* (Lahore, Ashraf, 1944) p. 255.
- <sup>33</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, pp. 112-13.
- <sup>34</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 4, 1906.
- <sup>35</sup>John Buchan, *Lord Minto : A Memoir*, p. 224.
- <sup>36</sup>Morley's letter to Minto, dated October 26, 1906, Lady Minto, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48.
- <sup>37</sup>M.S. Jain, *The Aligarh Movement, its Origin and Development*, pp. 153-54.
- <sup>38</sup>S. Razi Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
- <sup>39</sup>Lady Minto, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48.
- <sup>40</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-15.
- <sup>41</sup>Ramsay MacDonald, *Awakening of India*, p. 176.
- <sup>42</sup>B.L. Grover, *British Policy Towards Indian Nationalism*, p. 88.
- <sup>43</sup>AB. Rajput, *Muslim League Yesterday and Today*, (Lahore, Ashraf, 1948) pp. 19-20.
- <sup>44</sup>S.R. Mehrotra, *India and the Common Wealth*, p. 181.
- <sup>45</sup>Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk's statement, Cited in Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims: A Political History*, pp. 101-2.

- <sup>46</sup>Report of the Twenty-Ninth Indian National Congress, 1914, p. 1.
- <sup>47</sup>Chowdhury Khaliqzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (1961) p. 28.
- <sup>48</sup>Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918 (London, 1918) p. 5.
- <sup>49</sup>Valentine Chirol, *India, Old and New* (London, 1921) pp. 159-60.
- <sup>50</sup>Andrews and Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-61.
- <sup>51</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *Pakistan : The Formative Phase 1857-1958*, (1968) p. 45.
- <sup>52</sup>*Ibid.* p. 39.
- <sup>53</sup>*The Times of India*, December 30, 1916, January 1 and 2, 1917.
- <sup>54</sup>Sukumar Rajan Das, "Tagore and Indian Nationalism", *Indian Review*—Vol. XXXV, 1944, p. 10.
- <sup>55</sup>Sisir Kumar Mitra, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
- <sup>56</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
- <sup>57</sup>Cited in Sisir Kumar Mitra, *op. cit.*, 251.
- <sup>58</sup>Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, *Sixty Years of Congress*, p. 152.
- <sup>59</sup>Report of the Proceedings of the Nineteenth Indian National Congress, 1903, (1904) p. 24.
- <sup>60</sup>*India*, No. 309 (New Series), December 4, 1903.
- <sup>61</sup>Report of the Twentieth Indian National Congress, 1904, p. 44.
- <sup>62</sup>Lord Curzon in *India-Speeches*, Vol. II. (London, 1906) p. 222.
- <sup>63</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, February 18, 1905.
- <sup>64</sup>Sukumar Ranjan Das, "Tagore and Indian Nationalism", *Indian Review*; Vol. XXXV, 1944, p. 10.
- <sup>65</sup>*The Hindustan Review and Kayastha Samachar*, Vol. IX (New Series, Allahabad, 1904) p. 299.
- <sup>66</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. VI, 1905, p. 272.
- <sup>67</sup>Cited in R.P. Dua, *The Impact of the Russo-Japanese (1905), War on Indian Politics* (New Delhi, 1966) p. 23.
- <sup>68</sup>*The Bangalee*, March 26, 1905.
- <sup>69</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Glimpses of the World History* (New York, 1942) p. 834.
- <sup>70</sup>J.L. Nehru, *An Autobiography* (New Delhi, 1962) p. 16.
- <sup>71</sup>D.G. Karve, (ed) *Speeches and Writings of Gopal Krishan Gokhle*, Vol. II. (Bombay, 1966). p. 178.
- <sup>72</sup>G.K. Gokhle, "Self-Government for India", *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, New Series 3, XXII, 1906, p. 243.
- <sup>73</sup>Gopal Krishna Gokhle, *Speeches of the Hon'ble G.K. Gokhle*, p. 819.
- <sup>74</sup>B G. Tilak, *Writings and Speeches*, p. 330.
- <sup>75</sup>Ram Gopal, *Lokmanya Tilak : A Biography* (Bombay, 1956) p. 285.
- <sup>76</sup>Vartan Gregorian, *The Emergence of Modern Afghanistan*, (1969) p. 209.
- <sup>77</sup>D. Mackenzie Brown, *Indian Political Thought : From Ranade to Bhawe* (1961), pp. 8-9, and 72.
- <sup>78</sup>Paul F. Power, *Gandhi on World Affairs*, pp. 56-57.
- <sup>79</sup>Chamanlal, *Secrets of Japan* (1937), p. 20.
- <sup>80</sup>Lovett, *A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement* (London, 1921), p. 237.
- <sup>81</sup>Viscount Morley, *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 154.
- <sup>82</sup>R.G. Pradhan, *India's Struggle for Swaraj*, p. 75.
- <sup>83</sup>C.F. Andrews, *The Renaissance in India*, (London, 1912), p. 4.
- <sup>84</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
- <sup>85</sup>*The Daily Hitavadi*, June 12, 1905.
- <sup>86</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 14, 1905.
- <sup>87</sup>*The Sultan* (Calcutta), March 24, 1905.
- <sup>88</sup>Pratijna, Cited in R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.
- <sup>89</sup>*The Bangalee*, February 8, 1905.
- <sup>90</sup>Quoted in Lancelot Lawton, *Empire in the Far East*, Vol. II (London, 1912) p. 806.
- <sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*

- <sup>92</sup>Congress Presidential Addresses, 1911-1934, Second Series, pp. 311-12.
- <sup>93</sup>Report on the Native Newspapers of Bengal, p. 587.
- <sup>94</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>95</sup>Valentine Chirol, *India*, p. 113.
- <sup>96</sup>R.C. Majumdar, "The Genesis of Extremism", *The Studies in the Bengal Renaissance* (ed) by Atulchandra Gupta, (Jadavpur, 1958) p. 201.
- <sup>97</sup>Lovett, *A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement*, p. 229.
- <sup>98</sup>John Cumming (ed), *Political India*, p. 54 and 228.
- <sup>99</sup>R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- <sup>100</sup>Tripura Hitaishi (Comilla), June 20, 1905, in *Report on the Native Newspapers of Bengal*, pp. 632-33.
- <sup>101</sup>Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
- <sup>102</sup>*The Bengalee*, June 12, 1905.
- <sup>103</sup>Sant Nihal Singh, "Indian Students in Japan," *Indian Review*, September 1906, p. 673.
- <sup>104</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>105</sup>Valentine Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, p. 148.
- <sup>106</sup>R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
- <sup>107</sup>*The Indian Review*, July, 1906, p. 550.
- <sup>108</sup>Ram Gopal, *Lokmanya Tilak*, p. 233
- <sup>109</sup>*The Japan Weekly Mail*, May 5, 1906.
- <sup>110</sup>Shun Saitoh (ed) *Japan and India* (Kyobashi Tokyo, 1912), pp. 220-27.
- <sup>111</sup>James A.B. Scherer, *Japan's Advance* (Tokyo, 1934) pp. 99-102.
- <sup>112</sup>Shun Saitoh, (ed) *Japan and India*, p. 300.
- <sup>113</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. VIII, June 1907, p. 480.
- <sup>114</sup>*The Bengalee*, June 15, 1905.
- <sup>115</sup>Ramananda Chatterjee, (ed), *Towards Home Rule* (Calcutta, 1917) Part I, p. 147.
- <sup>116</sup>Ibid., p. 148.
- <sup>117</sup>Cited in *East* (Calcutta) July 16, 1905.
- <sup>118</sup>Lancelot Lawton, *op. cit.*, p. 807.
- <sup>119</sup>*Sanjivani*, (Calcutta), November 27, 1905.
- <sup>120</sup>Ramananda Chatterjee (ed), *Towards Home Rule*, Part II, pp. 97-98.
- <sup>121</sup>Shun Saitoh, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
- <sup>122</sup>*The Japan Weekly Mail*, April 7, 1906.
- <sup>123</sup>*The Bengalee*, January 12, 1905.
- <sup>124</sup>*The Japan Weekly Mail*, April 78, 1906.
- <sup>125</sup>Ibid., May 26, 1906.
- <sup>126</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>127</sup>Quoted in Lancelot Lawton, *op. cit.*, p. 805.
- <sup>128</sup>Quoted in R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- <sup>129</sup>Ibid., p. 49.
- <sup>130</sup>Ogata Taketora, "Mitsuru Toyama", *Contemporary Japan*, July 1940, Vol. IX, No. 7, p. 819.
- <sup>131</sup>Valentine Chirol, *op. cit.*, p. 147.
- <sup>132</sup>M.M. Ahluwalia, *Freedom Struggle in India, 1858-1909* (Delhi, 1965) p. 204.
- <sup>133</sup>Irving S. Friedman, "Indian Nationalism and the Far East," *Pacific Affairs*, No. XIII, March, 1940, p. 18.
- <sup>134</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>135</sup>D.B. Mathur, *Gokhale, A Political Biography*, pp. 210-19.
- <sup>136</sup>Ruchi Ram Sahni, *The Awakening of Asia* (Lahore, 1929) p. 28.
- <sup>137</sup>D.N. Verma, "Indian and Asian Solidarity, 1900-1939," *J.B.R.S.*, Vol. XLIX, 1963, p. 319.
- <sup>138</sup>Rajani Palm Dutt, *India Today*, (Bombay, 1947), p. 445.
- <sup>139</sup>Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan*, (1963) p. 54.

- <sup>140</sup>Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, *India Wins Freedom* (Delhi, 1959) p. 6.
- <sup>141</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 27, 1911.
- <sup>142</sup>*Ibid.*, March 5, 1912.
- <sup>143</sup>*Report of the Twenty Seventh, Indian National Congress*, p. 5.
- <sup>144</sup>Annie Besant, *How India Wrought for Freedom* (Madras, 1915) p. 554.
- <sup>145</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 29, 1911.
- <sup>146</sup>Sisir Gupta, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
- <sup>147</sup>Hans Kohn, *A History of Nationalism in the East* (1929) p. 48.
- <sup>148</sup>Lakshmi Kant Choudhury, *op. cit.*, p. 98.
- <sup>149</sup>Minto to Morley, May 9, 1906, *Minto Papers* M. 1005 No. 40.
- <sup>150</sup>S.R. Mehrotra, *India and the Commonwealth*, p. 184.
- <sup>151</sup>Joseph Chailley, *Administrative Problems of British India*, (1910), p. 76.
- <sup>152</sup>*Englishman*, (Calcutta) June 26, 1906
- <sup>153</sup>M. Mujeeb, *The Indian Muslims*, (1967), p. 439.
- <sup>154</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part A, March, 1913, No. 46.
- <sup>155</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part A, No. 45 (Government of U.P. to Government of India, July 16, 1916).
- <sup>156</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 9, 1911.
- <sup>157</sup>Mohammed Noman Muslim India, *Rise and Growth of the All India Muslim League* (Allahabad, 1942), p. 127.
- <sup>158</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 9, 1911.
- <sup>159</sup>*Ibid.*, November 4, 1911.
- <sup>160</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part A, March 1913, No. 47 (Chief Commissioner of North-West Frontier Province to Government of India, September 6, 1912).
- <sup>161</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 27, 1911.
- <sup>162</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political Part A, March 1913, No. 48 (Government of Punjab to Government of India, September 17, 1912).
- <sup>163</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>164</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 9, 1911.
- <sup>165</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political Part A, March 1913, No. 52. (Government of Madras to Government of India, November 1, 1912).
- <sup>166</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 24, 1911.
- <sup>167</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part A, March 1913, No. 50 (Government of Bombay to Government of India, October 21, 1912).
- <sup>168</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political Part A, March 1913, No. 51 (Government of Bengal to Government of India, October 28-29, 1912).
- <sup>169</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 3, 1911.
- <sup>170</sup>*Ibid.*, November 27, 1911.
- <sup>171</sup>*Ibid.*, December 27, 1911.
- <sup>172</sup>Lal Bahadur, *The Muslim League : Its History, Activities and Achievements* (Agra, 1954), pp. 97-100.
- <sup>173</sup>Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
- <sup>174</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part A, March 1913, No. 48 (Government of Punjab to Government of India, September 17, 1912).
- <sup>175</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, October, 1912 Nos. 2-3 (Annual Report on the native owned papers published in Punjab during 1911).
- <sup>176</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, August 1912, No. 89 (Government of U.P. to Government of India, August 9, 1912 enclosing an abstract translation of the Pumphlets).
- <sup>177</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part A, March 1913, No. 51 (Government of Bengal to Government of India, October 28-29, 1912).
- <sup>178</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>179</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, July 1912, No. 28 (Annual Report on native owned papers published in Bengal during 1911).

- <sup>180</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, June 1912, No. 47 (Annual Report on native owned papers published in Eastern Bengal and Assam during 1911).
- <sup>181</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Parts B, October 1912, Nos. 2-3 (Annual Report on the native owned papers published in Punjab during 1911).
- <sup>182</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, July 1912, No. 28, (Annual Report on native-owned papers published in the Bengal during 1911).
- <sup>183</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, June 1912, Nos. 47
- <sup>184</sup>Government of India, Home Department, Political, Part B, August 1912, Nos. 35-36, (Annual Report on native-owned papers Published in the Bombay Presidency during 1911).
- <sup>185</sup>Dwight, E. Lee, "The Origins of Pan-Islamism," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. XL VII, 1941-42, pp. 278-87.
- <sup>185a</sup>Jan. Romein, *The Asian Century : A History of Modern Nationalism in Asia* (London, 1962), p. 48.
- <sup>186</sup>Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- <sup>187</sup>Jan Romein, *op. cit.*, p. 65.
- <sup>188</sup>Hardings to Crew, October 30, 1912 cited in R.L. Shukla, "Some Aspects of Indian Muslim Response to the Balkan War", A paper read at the 34th session of the Indian History Congress held at Chandigarh in December, 1973.
- <sup>189</sup>Hardinge to Crew, August 14, 1913, *Ibid.*
- <sup>190</sup>Lord Hardinge to Marquess of Crew, August 8, 1912, *Ibid.*
- <sup>191</sup>Mohammad Noman, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
- <sup>192</sup>Mohammad Ali, *My Life: A Fragment* (1942) p. 57.
- <sup>193</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. XIII, 1912, p. 833.
- <sup>194</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>195</sup>Jawahar Lal Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 10.
- <sup>196</sup>Government of India, Home Deptt. Political, Part A, No. 117, D.O. from H.Le Mesurier to H. Wheeler, September 27, 1913.
- <sup>197</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 31, 1912.
- <sup>198</sup>Lal Bahadur, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- <sup>199</sup>Hans Kohn, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
- <sup>200</sup>Lal Bahadur, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- <sup>201</sup>Government of India, Home Deptt. Political, Part A, No. 118, (U.P. Government to Government of India, September 17, 1913).
- <sup>202</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>203</sup>Government of India, Home Deptt. Political, Part A, No. 111, May 1913, (Bengal Government to Government of India, April 10, 1913).
- <sup>204</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>205</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>206</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>207</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>208</sup>Government of India, Home Deptt. Political, Part A, No. 101, October 1913, (D.O. from A.G. Cardew to H. Wheeler, July 29, 1913).
- <sup>209</sup>*Ibid.*, No. 117 (D.O. from B. Robertson to H. Wheeler, September 18, 1913).
- <sup>210</sup>*Ibid.*, (D.O. from G.A. Barron to H. Wheeler, October 11, 1913).
- <sup>211</sup>*Ibid.*, (D.O. from J. Donald to H. Wheeler, October 5, 1913).
- <sup>212</sup>*Ibid.*, (D.O. from C.C. Watson to H. Wheeler, September 24, 1913).
- <sup>213</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 8, 1912.
- <sup>214</sup>*Ibid.*, November 11, 1912.
- <sup>215</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 10.
- <sup>216</sup>Michael O'Dwyer, *India As A Knew It, 1885-1925* (1925) p. 172.
- <sup>217</sup>Government of India, Home Deptt. Political, Part B, No. 149, November 1913.
- <sup>218</sup>Mohammed Ali, *My Life, A Fragment*, pp. 49-50.
- <sup>219</sup>Government of India Home Deptt., Political, Part A, No. 118, U.P. Government to Government of India, September 17, 1913).

- <sup>220</sup>*Government of India Home Deptt. Political, Part A. No. 111, May 1913, (Government of Bengal to Government of India, April 10, 1913).*
- <sup>221</sup>*Hardinge Papers, Vol. 118, Letter No. 60, Hardinge to Crew, December 6, 1912.*
- <sup>222</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. 119, Letter No. 20, Hardinge to Crew, April 24, 1913.
- <sup>223</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. 119, Letter No. 15, Hardinge to Crew, April 3, 1913.
- <sup>224</sup>*Government of India, Home Deptt., Political, Part A, No. 111, May 1913. (Government of Bengal to Government of India, April 10, 1913).*
- <sup>225</sup>Cited A.H. Albiruni, *Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India*, (1950), p. 136.
- <sup>226</sup>*Government of India Home Deptt., Political, Part A, No. 111, May 1913.*
- <sup>227</sup>*Ibid.*, Nos. 45-55, March 1913, (D O. from Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government to H. Wheeler, February 18, 1913).
- <sup>228</sup>*Government of India, Home Deptt. Political, Part B, No. 149, November, 1913.*
- <sup>229</sup>*Government of India, Foreign Department, Nos. 28-31, August 1913, Ext. I, B. (Secret).*
- <sup>230</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 4, 1912.
- <sup>231</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>232</sup>*Hardinge Papers, Vol. 118, Letter No. 55, Hardinge to Crew, November 13, 1912.*
- <sup>233</sup>*Report of the Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Indian National Congress, 1912. (1912)*
- p. 5.
- <sup>234</sup>*Ibid*
- <sup>235</sup>*Congress Presidential Addresses : From Silver to the Golden Jubilee 1911, 1934 (Second Series)*, pp. 65-66.
- <sup>236</sup>*Report of the Twenty-Eighth Indian National Congress held at Karachi on December 26, 27 and 28, 1913*, p. 56.
- <sup>237</sup>Quoted in Hans Kohn, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
- <sup>238</sup>V.P.S. Raghuvanshi, *Indian Nationalist Movement and Thought* (1951) p. 140.
- <sup>239</sup>Khaliquzzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan*, (1961) p. 28.
- <sup>240</sup>M. Mujeeb, *op. cit.*, p. 434.
- <sup>241</sup>R.C. Majumdar, (ed) *The History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom* (1969), p. 220.
- <sup>242</sup>A.C. Bose, *Indian Revolutionaries Abroad, 1905-1920 in the Background of International Developments*, (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Patna University, 1968) p. 172.
- <sup>243</sup>N.M.P. Srivastava "World War, and Indian Provisional Government in Kabul". *Journal of Historical Research*, (Ranchi University), Vol. XVI, August 1973, p. 58.
- <sup>244</sup>Michael O' Dwyer, *op. cit.*, p. 176.
- <sup>245</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 176-77.
- <sup>246</sup>*Report of the Sedition Committee 1918*, pp. 177-78.
- <sup>247</sup>Raja Mahendra Pratap, "Pahali Azad Sena" *Panchjanya*, April 29, 1968, p. 72.
- <sup>248</sup>S. Abid Husain, *The Destiny of Indian Muslims*, p. 76.
- <sup>249</sup>Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
- <sup>250</sup>Sachindranath Sanyal, *Bandijiwan* (Appendix) (1963) p. 416.
- <sup>251</sup>S. Abid Husain, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
- <sup>252</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People: Struggle for Freedom* p. 223.
- <sup>253</sup>Michael O'Dwyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 180-81.
- <sup>254</sup>*Metson Collection, Mss, Eur, F 136/1; pp. 22-24. (Correspondence between Abdul Bari and the Deoband College).*
- <sup>255</sup>*Government of India, Home Deptt., Political, Part B, July 1916, No. 442 (Weekly Report of the Director, Criminal Intelligence, July 8, 1916).*
- <sup>256</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>257</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>258</sup>M.H. Saiyid, *Mohammed Ali Jinnah : A Political Study* (1945), p. 885.
- <sup>259</sup>*Government of India, Home Deptt., Political, Part B, July 1916, No. 443. (Weekly Report of the Director, Criminal Intelligence, July 1916).*
- <sup>260</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>261</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>262</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>263</sup>Quoted in Yuvraj Deva Prasad, "*India Muslims and the Arab Revolt*". (a paper presented to the 34th Session of the Indian History Congress held at Chandigarh, 1973).

<sup>264</sup>*Government of India, Home Dept., Political, Part B, July 1916, No. 442.*

<sup>265</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>266</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>267</sup>Yuvraj Deva Prasad, *op. cit.*,

## CHAPTER IV

# FROM DOMINION TO INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION AND THE ATTEMPTS—MADE TO PROMOTE ASIAN SOLIDARITY (1919-29)

THE FIRST World War marked the beginning of the end of European colonialism in Asia and ushered in an era of intense nationalist struggles for independence from the Western domination. Though, the Great War of 1914-18 was from the Asian point of view a civil war within the European Community of nations,<sup>1</sup> it marked the *deglorification*<sup>2</sup> of the West in India and also the retreat of Europe in the Asian Continent.<sup>3</sup> From the point of view of Asian nationalism the war proved to be a blessing in disguise. Not only the educated but the great mass of the people saw the myth of European superiority destroyed as the Allied Powers sought the help of the Asiatics in conducting the war. As a matter of fact a new epoch dawned in the struggle between the East and the West.<sup>4</sup> The Western powers sowed the seeds of the liquidation of their empires in the East by formulating new ideas in their war aims. In propaganda campaign against the Germans the Allied Powers accepted the principle of national self-determination which caught the imagination of the Asian people. The Great War quickened the national consciousness, not by prowess of arms but by the political doctrines which it called forth, and especially by the doctrine of self-determination.<sup>5</sup> The Asian placed under the umbrella of Western domination began to ask for the application of the principle of self-determination in Asia for which the Asiatics had supported the Allied powers in men and money and for which, as the Allied powers declared, the war was being fought.

The First World War induced a new psychology in India.<sup>6</sup> Great Britain and other Allied Powers had declared that the war was being fought to save democracy and to guarantee the right of self-determination which kindled a new hope and enthusiasm among the Indian people and a new hope has filled the hearts of the people, a hope that something is going to happen which will raise the motherland to a higher status.<sup>7</sup> But developments after the war proved that these promises were high sounding nothings. After the war the British Government took repressive measures to thwart the nationalist movement in India and there emerged a new class of nationalists in India. Gandhiji appeared on the firmament of Nationalist India and dominated the political scene of India for next twenty-five years.

Instead of getting self-rule or other concessions India received the Rowlatt Acts which armed the Government with unrestricted powers to control the press, to try the political offenders without the help of juries and to arrest and detain a person

suspected of subversive activities for any length of time without holding a trial, Indians took a serious note of these repressive measures designed to throttle and suppress even the legitimate rights of the Indians. When the bill was in the Parliament Surendranath Banerjee, Srinivas Sastri, Tej Bahadur Sapru and Jinnah had warned the government that they would have no Indian behind them if they passed the Bills into Acts.<sup>8</sup>

In spite of the repeated protests of the Indian leaders the Government of India passed an Act, known as Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act 1919. This new Act or the *Black Act*, as it was dubbed by the nationalists, posed a serious challenge to the Nationalist India which at the call of Gandhiji observed a nationwide strike on April 6, 1919 to protest against the repressive measures adopted by the government. Gandhiji was arrested on April 15, 1919. The Punjab Government imposed martial law in the province. The arrest of Gandhi and other leaders provoked the people in many towns of India. The Government perpetrated a reign of terror at Jallianawalla Bagh, Amritsar, on April 13, 1919. To disperse a meeting of the innocent and unarmed people at Jallianawalla Bagh the Government indulged in the blood bath resulting in heavy casualties. The massacre of Jallianawalla Bagh, which was unparalleled in the history of the world, horrified the nation and the whole country was excited over it. At a time when the whole country was in a state of excitement over Jallianawalla Bagh massacre, the Khilafat question added fuel to the fire. Indian Muslims had supported the British against the Sultan of Turkey on the assurance that nothing would be done to dismember Turkey but on the termination of the war, which had resulted in the defeat of Turkey, the Indian Muslims were full of misgivings about the fate of Turkey and the Caliphate. Gandhiji realised the significance of the moment and spared no pains to forge a united front of the Hindus and Muslims for the cause of the nation by supporting the Khilafat movement. Both Hindus and Muslims, the Congress and the Muslim League working under the spirit of the Lucknow Pact of 1916 joined together and forged a united front to get the redressal of the two wrongs namely the Khilafat and Punjab atrocities.

It was in this tense atmosphere that the All India Khilafat Conference was held in November 1919 and was presided over by Gandhi who urged the Hindus to co-operate with Muslims on the Khilafat issue.<sup>9</sup> After the submission of the Hunter Report in March 1920, Gandhi lost faith in the British Government and under the leadership of Gandhi the Khilafat Committee adopted a programme of non co-operation which was launched on August 1, 1920. The Muslims League was persuaded to agree to follow Gandhi's lead.<sup>10</sup> The special session of the Congress held in September 1920 at Calcutta adopted Gandhi's programme of non-co-operation unless the two wrongs (the Khilafat and Punjab atrocities) were redressed.<sup>11</sup> The annual session of the Congress held at Nagpur in December 1920, which looked almost like a Muslim session,<sup>12</sup> ratified the resolution relating to the non-violent non-co-operation<sup>13</sup> which included surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in the local bodies, boycott of government educational institutions, law courts and legislatures, boycott of foreign goods, non-payment of taxes and adoption of Swadeshi.<sup>14</sup> Jinnah opposed Gandhi's non co-operation programme and resigned from the Congress<sup>15</sup>. However, the movement for Swaraj and non-co-operation moved on and the Muslims in large numbers co-operated with the Congress,

Throughout 1920 and 1921 the Non-co-operation movement continued with full vigour. C.R. Das, Motilal Nehru, C. Rajagopalachari, Rajendra Prasad, Vallabhbhai Patel and several others left their roaring practices and joined Gandhi and rallied to the support of the Non-co-operation movement which was in its full swing. The government resorted to repressive measures and most of the leaders were placed behind the bars. Politically awakened Indians wanted to move on to the next stage of the struggle *i.e.* Civil Disobedience. Gandhi decided to try it first in Bardoli in Surat district and wrote a letter to the Viceroy on February 1, 1922 demanding among other things the release of the arrested leaders and threatened the Viceroy that if these demands would not be conceded he would launch civil disobedience in Bardoli. On February 6, the Viceroy rejected the demands included in Gandhi's ultimatum. In the meantime, an infuriated mob of Chauri Chaura village in Gorakhpur District, U.P., set fire to a police station and murdered twenty one policemen. These events shocked Gandhiji, the apostle of non-violence, who suspended the movement of Civil Disobedience on February 12, 1922. This caused great indignation among the leaders of the Congress and the devotees and admirers of Gandhi were the loudest in denouncing his action.<sup>16</sup> In the meantime Gandhi was arrested on March 13, 1922 and in his trial, which began on, March 18, at Ahmedabad, Gandhiji took full responsibility for the occurrences in Madras, Bombay and Chauri Chaura and added: "I know I was playing with fire. I ran the risk and if I was set free, I would still do the same".<sup>17</sup> When the Congress met at Gaya in 1922 a rift occurred in the Congress. Some Congress leaders including C.R. Das, Motilal Nehru and Madan Mohan Malaviya, wanted to work out the reforms of 1919 and favoured Council entry to follow a plan of continuous obstruction for mending or ending the new constitution. To the followers of Gandhiji it was a deviation from the creed of the Congress. Those who stood for Council entry lost by 1740 to 890 votes.<sup>18</sup> Without being discouraged, C.R. Das and Motilal formed Swaraj Party on January 1, 1923 which aimed at the attainment of Swaraj but its immediate objective was the speedy attainment of full Dominion Status.<sup>19</sup> The party contested the general elections in November 1923 and won 42 out of 101 elective seats in the Central Legislature. The Swarajists with the support of the Independents led by Jinnah held a meeting at Delhi on February 3, 1924 and endorsed Jinnah's resolution asking the Government to take steps immediately for the establishment of full responsible Government.<sup>20</sup> But the Swarajists could not be effective in doing something positive by their entry in the councils and after C.R. Das's death the Swaraj party began to lose its popularity. M.R. Jayakar, N.C. Kelkar and Moonje left the Swaraj Party and formed the Responsivist Party with Jayakar as its President. The Responsivists joined hands with the Independents on April 3, 1926 at Bombay and formed the National Party with the object of preparing the country for the establishment of Swaraj of the Dominion type.<sup>21</sup> When such unwarranted developments were taking place in the Congress Camp Gandhi was released from the jail. Though he was opposed to council entry, he was more anxious to preserve the unity of the Congress. In order to bring back the Swarajists to the Congress camp he effected a compromise at the annual session of the Congress in 1924 where it was agreed that the work in the Central and provincial legislatures should be carried on by the Swaraj Party on behalf of the Congress and

as an integral part of the Congress organisation.<sup>22</sup> Gandhiji, in his presidential address for the Congress in 1924, expressed his opinion against a complete severance of the British connection.<sup>23</sup> At the Gauhati Congress held in December 1926, the radicals in the Congress made determined efforts to get the Congress committed to complete independence and severance of the British connection but it was Gandhi who foiled their attempts.<sup>24</sup>

The Indian National Movement entered into a critical phase of its progress in the first few years of the twenties of the present century. If on the one hand, the solidarity of the Congress was endangered in the wake of the divisions in the Congress camp, the cordial relation between the Hindus and Muslims fostered by the Khilafat movement was imperilled by the growing dissensions between the two communities. The Khilafat movement lost its significance when on March 3, 1924 Mustafa Kemal Pasha exiled the Khalifa and abolished the Khilafat. With the abolition of Khilafat the great factor which had cemented the Hindu-Muslim unity also paled into insignificance. In the preceding years of the abolition of the Khilafat Hindu-Muslim unity was at its height. In 1921, at the time of Bakrid Muslims voluntarily gave up the sacrifice of cows. Swami Shradhananda, one of the Arya Samaj leaders, was allowed to enter the Jama Masjid of Delhi to deliver an address.<sup>25</sup> But soon this unity came to the rocks and communal clashes in Multan and Bengal in September, 1922 added to the communal frenzy. The Moplah's *wanton and unprovoked attack on the Hindus*<sup>26</sup> and the conversion of thousands of Hindus to Islam created a horror in the Hindus who started the Shuddhi and Sangathan movement.<sup>27</sup> These Shuddhi and Sangathan movements increased communal bitterness and gave birth to the Tabligh and Tanzim movements. Swami Shradhananda, who had supported the Muslims in the Khilafat movement and whom the Muslims had permitted to address the Muslims from the pulpit of the Jama Masjid, was murdered by a Muslim in December 1926. This led to the mutual distrust, bickering and rivalry between the Hindus and Muslims. The Muslims who had organised in 1919 to defend Islam against Cross were in 1927 talking of organising themselves in defence of Islam against the Hindus.<sup>28</sup>

However, the catastrophe of Hindu-Muslim confrontation was averted for the time being on account of the appointment of the all white Simon Commission on November 8, 1927, to report on the working of the constitutional reforms in India. Lord Birkenhead, the Secretary of State for India, provoked the Indian sentiment by declaring that he could not find suitable Indians to represent India.<sup>29</sup> Indians of all shades of political opinion expressed their indignation at the exclusion of the Indians from the Commission. A public meeting organised by Tej Bahadur Sapru at Allahabad on December 11, 1927, regarded the exclusion of Indians a deliberate insult to the people of India.<sup>30</sup> The non-inclusion of Indians on the Commission aroused universal indignation in India and Jawaharlal Nehru and others gave a reply to the *arrogant and insulting challenge* by declaring at the Madras Congress Session in 1927 that the goal of the Indian people was to attain complete National Independence.<sup>31</sup>

Mohammed Ali Jinnah, who had resigned from the Congress in 1920, had not ceased to be a nationalist. In November 1927 the League and the Congress, owing to the efforts of Jinnah, started drawing closer to each other and the constitution

of the all white Simon Commission gave encouragement to these moves for Hindu-Muslim solidarity, Indians of all shades of political opinion boycotted the Simon Commission. Everywhere it was greeted with the slogan of "*Simon go back*". Lala Lajpat Rai, Jawaharlal Nehru and other Indian leaders had to face the lathi-charge but the boycott was complete. The Muslim League was divided over the issue of boycott of Simon Commission. A section of the Muslim League headed by Sir Muhammad Shafi stood for co-operating with the Commission. The other section under the leadership of Jinnah held a meeting at Calcutta on December 30, 1927 and called upon the Muslims to "have nothing to do with the Commission at any stage or in any form".<sup>32</sup>

The Congress convened an All Parties Conference in Delhi towards the end of February, 1928 in which twenty-nine parties participated. The All Parties Conference was also held in Bombay on May 19, 1928. The Conference appointed a sub-committee under the presidentship of Motilal Nehru to draft a constitution. The Nehru Report was published on August 14, 1928. The report of the Nehru Committee which included members representing the Liberals, Hindu Mahasabha, Muslims, non-Brahmins, the Sikh League and Labour,<sup>33</sup> recommended Dominion Status as the basis of the Indian Constitution and was not in favour of separate electorates. It recommended joint electorates with one communal safeguard which was reservation of seats only for the Muslims where they were in a minority. The Nehru Report was considered by the All Parties Conference held in Lucknow in August, 1928 and was unanimously accepted but the Conference enlarged the Nehru Committee for studying certain problems that had cropped up since the publication of the Report.<sup>34</sup> The Nehru Report produced mixed reaction among the Indians. The Report was denounced by Shaukat Ali who observed : "As a Young man, he had been a keen owner of greyhounds, but he had never seen greyhounds deal with a hare as the Hindus proposed to deal with the Muslims".<sup>35</sup> In December 1928, leaders of all parties met in an All-India Convention at Calcutta to consider the Nehru Report. The Report was supported by Maulana Azad, Sir Ali Imam and Dr. Ansari. The Khilafat leaders and the Muslim League headed by Shafi condemned the report and they wanted separate electorates and federal constitution with the weak centre for India.

Furthermore, the Khilafat leaders criticised the Nehru Report for its acceptance of Dominion Status for India.<sup>36</sup> Jinnah demanded that the Muslims should have one third of the seats in the future Parliament of India. He declared that if the Muslims demands would be conceded they would be reconciled to the Hindus and both the Hindus and Muslims would march hand in hand in future.<sup>37</sup> But Jinnah's demands were rejected. M.R. Jayakar, who represented the Hindu Mahasabha's point of view, stressed that Jinnah represented only a small minority of Muslims and therefore there was no guarantee that if the demands of Jinnah were accepted, the rest of the Muslims would abide by such an agreement. Jayakar also warned the convention not to give more concessions to Muslims because it would alienate the support of the Hindus.<sup>38</sup> Muhammad Azizul Haque, one of the Muslim League delegates to the All Parties Convention, pointed out that the only reason why the Congress and Muslim League leaders could not reach a settlement was because of the unwillingness of the Hindu leaders to concede thirty three percent seats to the

Muslim League in the Central Legislature.<sup>39</sup> Disappointed at the deliberations of the Convention Jinnah with tears in his eyes told a friend, "This is the parting of the ways".<sup>40</sup>

The All Parties Convention did not bring any tangible result. Different factions of the Muslims joined together and the All-India Muslim Conference was held in Delhi on January 1, 1929 under the presidentship of the Aga Khan. The All-India Muslim Conference demanded a federal system of government for India, with complete autonomy and residuary powers vested in the Constituent States, separate electorates for the Muslims; weightage for the Muslims in the Hindu majority provinces, due Muslim share in the cabinets and the services, the adequate safeguards for Muslim religion and language and non-interference with the Muslims in Bengal and Punjab where the Muslims formed the majority. The Conference emphatically declared that no constitution would be acceptable to the Indian Muslims unless it conformed with the principles embodied in this resolution.<sup>41</sup> Jinnah also changed his grounds and in a special meeting of the Muslim League held on March 28, 1929 he formulated his Fourteen Points. Jinnah proposed to join the Hindus in the struggle for freedom if the Muslims were conceded one third representation in the Central Legislature. He envisaged a federation of Hindu and Muslim majority provinces and effective representation of the Muslims, separate electorates; adequate share to the Muslims in all Cabinets, services; unalterability of the constitution unless every state agreed; the right of a community to veto a resolution in the legislature if three fourth of the members of that community in the legislatures exercised it.<sup>42</sup> Thus, both the Congress and the Muslim League held divergent opinions and the two organisations began to move into two different directions. The Moderate leaders in Muslim Community viewed with concern the growth of the idea of complete independence in India. Jinnah in his letter to Ramsay MacDonald pointed out that India has lost her faith in Great Britain and informed the Prime Minister that it was very difficult to persuade the Indians to co-operate in the future stages of constitution making unless the British Government made a wholly fresh move and granted full responsible Government with Dominion Status.<sup>43</sup>

At a time when the Muslim League had parted with the Congress in the All Parties Convention in December 1928 and was demanding Dominion Status for India, the Indian National Congress, under the leadership of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, S. Srinivas Iyengar, stood for complete independence. But the Congress could not accept it as a national creed at the Calcutta session of 1928, where Jawahar Lal asked the moderate Congress leaders that if they were prepared to pull down the flag of independence they must give him and his associates the freedom to hold on to that flag.<sup>44</sup> He further declared : "Before a new bridge is built on the basis of friendship and co-operation, the present chains which tie us to England must be severed only then can real co-operation take place".<sup>45</sup> Gandhiji disapproved of the view point of these radicals and urged the impatient Youth of the country to wait a while.<sup>46</sup> Gandhiji put forward a compromise solution at the Calcutta session and suggested that the Dominion Status should be accepted, provided the British Parliament accepted the Nehru Constitution in its entirety within a year. It was also decided that if the Government did not accept the Nehru Report by December 1929 the Congress would stand for complete independence

and start Satyagrah to achieve it.<sup>47</sup>

The revolutionary activities of Bhagat Singh and Batukeshwar Dutt and their bomb throwing in the Assembly on April 8, 1929, the Satyagrah movement and no rent campaign of the peasants of Bardoli in Surat convinced Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, that India was passing through "*critical days*."<sup>48</sup> Lord Irwin took the initiative and visited London for consultations with the Labour Ministers who came to power in June, 1929 and impressed upon them the necessity for a fresh move for constitution making in India. On October 31, 1929 Lord Irwin announced that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as contemplated in the Government of India Act, 1919, was Dominion Status. Lord Irwin stated that with a view to discussing the next constitutional advancement there would be held a Round Table Conference of the representatives of British India and the Indian States with the British Government.<sup>49</sup> But the adverse criticism of Irwin's declaration in Britain by both Liberals and Conservatives compelled the Congress to believe that the British Government did not mean business.<sup>50</sup> Thereupon, the Lahore Congress in December, 1929 under the presidentship of Jawahar Lal Nehru declared its goal to be the achievement of complete independence for India. It was resolved that the proposed Round Table Conference should be boycotted, that Congressmen should walk out of the Central and provincial legislatures and a civil disobedience movement be launched at a proper time in the near future.<sup>51</sup> The Congress declaration for complete independence marked a new turn in the history of Indian National Movement.

During this period of intense nationalism (1918-29) the Indian National Movement shifted from the demand for Dominion Status to complete independence. While Indian National Movement passed through so many trials and the Indian leaders were awefully busy in defining its objectives and in forging a united front to deal with the British, they did not remain aloof from the neighbours in Asia and spared time to look to them and their problems.

Turkey was the first Asian country which received the attention of the Indian leaders. Indian Muslims had supported the British Government in conducting the war against the Central European powers and Turkey on the assurance that nothing would be done to jeopardise the interests of Turkey. Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, announced on January 5, 1918 that the Allies were not fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race.<sup>52</sup> After the war the Muslims of India were disappointed by the Machiavellian policy of the British Government. Indian Muslims became perturbed at the reported news of the harsh terms of the treaty made with Turkey after the war. They became ashamed of their own guilt in bringing the downfall of the Khilafat as they had served the British army, fought against their own brethren of Turkey in several battles. To express sympathy with Turkey and Caliph the Khilafat movement sprang up and the Muslims mobilised all their resources for exerting their influence on the British Government to do justice with Turkey and to prevent the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire.

Though the movement was at first animated by a spirit of Pan-Islamism, it was also the first opportunity to demonstrate India's solidarity with a fellow Asian Country. To show oneness with Turkey the All India Muslim League in its meeting in December 1918 urged upon the British Government to pay regard to the prevail-

ing attitude of the Indian Muslims regarding the fate of Turkey and the sacred places of Islam. Reminding the British Government that the collapse of Turkey would have far reaching effects on the minds of even the loyal Mussalmans of India the All India Muslim League requested the British Government and her representatives at the Paris Peace Conference to use their influence and to see that in the territorial and political redistribution to be made the fullest consideration should be paid to the requirements of the Islamic law with regard to the full and independent control by the Sultan of Turkey over the Holy Places and over the Jazirat-ul-Arab as delineated in the Muslim books. The League further expressed the hope that in determining the political relations of the Empire in future the British Government would pay heed to the sentiments of the Indian Muslims and would try to effect a complete reconciliation between the Empire and the Muslim States on terms of equity and justice in the interests of both the British Empire and the Muslim world.<sup>53</sup>

A mass meeting of the Muslims of Madras was held on January 17, 1919 to discuss the situation in Turkey. Yakub Hassan, in his presidential speech for the meeting, held the British responsible for bringing war into Asia and appealed to the British Government not to dismember Turkey.<sup>54</sup> The Bengal Presidency Muslim League at its meeting held at Mymensingh on April 22, 1919 passed a resolution demanding the continuance of the sovereignty of the Sultan of Turkey over the Jazirat-ul-Arab. It emphatically protested against any attempt to weaken the authority of the Sultan over the said territories inasmuch as any such attempt would affect the religious beliefs of the Mussalmans in India.<sup>55</sup> An emergent meeting of the Madras Liberal League held on September 2, 1919 appealed to the British Government to use all its influence to prevent the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire and the transfer of the homelands of the Turkish nation to other nationalities.<sup>56</sup> In a largely attended meeting of the Mohammedans held at Bombay on September 18, 1919 the questions of Khilafat and the preservation of the holy places of Islam were discussed. The special feature of the meeting was the presence of Gandhi who addressed the meeting and shared the sentiments expressed. In his presidential speech Mohammed Chotani appealed to the Paris Peace Conference not to commit any such blunder in the settlement regarding the Turkish Empire as might lead to wounding the religious susceptibilities of the Indian Muslims. This public meeting expressed its indignation at the contemplated move to dismember the Turkish Empire by internationalising Constantinople and Cession of Thrace to Greece and the giving of Mandates of Hejaz, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia to different European powers and emphatically protested against this intended act of spoliation.<sup>57</sup> On September 22, 1919 about five thousand Muslims from all parts of India attended the All India Muslim Conference held at Lucknow under the Chairmanship of Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal. The Conference passed eight resolutions sympathising with Turkey and expressing India's solidarity with the Sultan. The Conference asked for the freedom of the holy places from all non-Muslim influence; demanded evacuation of Smyrna and of Hinterland by Greece, and the Turkish Sovereignty over Thrace, Asia Minor and Constantinople. The Conference fixed October 17, 1919 as an universal day of prayer in Islamic India for the preservation of the Khalifa's full dignity and for holding meetings of protest. Muslim members of the Viceroy's Council expressed full sympathy with the objects of the

Conference.<sup>58</sup> To express solidarity with Turkey and the Caliph October 17, 1919 was observed as Khilafat Day—day of fasting and prayer in India. Meetings in support of Turkey were organised.<sup>59</sup>

Gandhiji was anxious to present a United Front of Hindus and Muslims against the British. He seized the opportunity when the Muslims were agitated over the Khilafat issue. He set out on an ambitious plan of forging Hindu-Muslim unity by supporting wholeheartedly the Khilafat movement of the Indian Muslims. He issued a message on November 1, 1919 declaring that Indians would not participate in Peace Celebration so long as the Khilafat wrong remained unredressed.<sup>60</sup> On November 3, 1919 the All India Muslim League sent a cable to the British Prime Minister, Secretary of State for India and the Islamic Bureau, London, expressing alarm and indignation at the attitude of the British Prime Minister towards the Turkish question as disclosed by Sheffield Speech which foreshadowed anti-Turkish and anti-Muslim nature of the settlement. The Council of the League warned the British that such an attitude would drive the Indian Muslims to a resolve to abstain from participating in the Peace Celebration of the Empire.<sup>61</sup>

Indian Muslims organised the Khilafat Movement to protest against the dismemberment of Turkey. They were supported by the Hindus and other non Muslim communities in India. Mahatma Gandhi gave his wholehearted support to the movement as a result of which the movement became widespread and the Khilafat issue a national issue. The first Khilafat conference was held in Delhi on November 23, 1919. Hindus were invited by the Muslims to attend the Delhi Khilafat Conference.<sup>62</sup> Gandhi, who was present in the meeting, urged the Muslims to remain non-violent, but cease to co-operate with the Government in case the British Government did not abandon their anti-Turkish policy.<sup>63</sup> The Conference urged the Indian Muslims to refrain from participating in the forth-coming victory celebrations and requested all the Khilafat committees and Indian Muslims to render all possible help to all India anti-Peace Celebration Committee of Delhi with Dr M.A. Ansari as its president whose aims were to widely disseminate the reasons for abstention from the *victory carnival*. The Conference resolved that in the event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place, the Mussalmans of India would progressively withhold all co-operation from the British Government and would boycott all British goods. It further resolved to send a deputation on behalf of the Mussalmans of India to England for acquainting the British Government and other publicmen the true sentiments of the Indian Muslims with regard to Turkish and Khilafat questions. It was also decided that a deputation should go to the United States for the same purpose.<sup>64</sup>

The Indian National Congress at its Amritsar session in December, 1919 discussed the Turkish problem. Referring to the Khilafat issue, Motilal Nehru, the president of the session, declared that it was impossible for one part of the nation to stand aloof while the other part was suffering from a serious grievance and assured the Muslims of the sympathy of the Hindus in the distress of the former over the fate of the Caliphate. Reminding the British Government of the assurances given by Lloyd George the Congress President emphatically declared: "Muslim India, nay United India, demands that full effect be given to those assurances".<sup>65</sup> The Congress President asked the British Government to apply the principle of self-

determination to the component parts of the Turkish Empire as it had been applied to in cases of Poland and Yugoslavia and further asked the Government the reason behind the different treatment being given to Syria, Mesopotamia and Palestine. The position of Khilafat-ul-Islam, the Congress President agreed, was a subject matter to be decided by the Muslims and the British Government should pay regard to it.<sup>66</sup> The Amritsar session of the Congress appealed to the British Government to settle the Turkish question in accordance with the just and legitimate sentiments of Indian Mussalmans without which, the Congress warned, there would be no real contentment among the people of India.<sup>67</sup>

The All India Muslim League at its meeting at Amritsar on December 29, 1919 discussed the Turkish problem. Prominent Congress leaders like Gandhi, Pandit Malviya, B.N. Sharma, Ramaswami Iyer attended the meeting. The League reiterated its devotion to the sacred person of the Sultan who was the successor of the Prophet and the head of Islam, and warned the British Government that no settlement contemplating the dismemberment of Turkey would ever satisfy the Indian Mussalmans and they would be fully justified to carry on all possible methods of constitutional agitation open to them including a boycott of the British army to be used outside India for imperial or anti-Islamic purposes.<sup>68</sup>

Sympathy for Turkey was so universal in India that even the moderate leaders became critical of British policy in regard to Turkey. The Moderate Conference held at Calcutta on December 30, 1919 deeply regretted the long delay in the settlement of satisfactory peace terms with Turkey and viewed with grave concern every political action which might tend to affect the position or dignity of the Sultan of Turkey as the Khalifa or the guardian of the holy places of Islam. The Conference emphatically stated that any settlement which disregarded the sentiments of the Muslim world would create widespread discontent.<sup>69</sup> The All India Khilafat Conference held on December 31, 1919 at Amritsar, which was attended by Mahatma Gandhi, Swami Shradhananda, Mohmed Ali, Dr. Ansari, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Pandit Malviya, Jinnah and Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Choudhry, reiterated its decision to send two deputations of the Muslims to England and America and to send a representative Muslim deputation to Constantinople to express sentiments of Islamic brotherhood before the Sultan of Turkey. The Conference regretted that the demands of the Indian Muslims regarding the Khilafat, holy places, and the preservation of the pre-war status of the Ottoman Empire had not yet been accepted and declared that the Indian Muslims still stood firmly by those demands. The Conference further resolved to open a Khilafat fund and to instruct the Central Khilafat Committee of India, Bombay, to make the necessary arrangements for the collection of ten lakh rupees. It requested the Indian Muslims to render every possible assistance to the Central Khilafat Committee in carrying out sympathetic and assistance works in Turkey.<sup>70</sup> Many Hindu leaders supported the resolutions adopted by this Khilafat Conference and even Swami Shradhananda, the veteran Arya Samajist, extended his hearty support to the proceedings of the Conference.<sup>71</sup>

A deputation under the leadership of Dr. Ansari met the Viceroy on January 19, 1920 and impressed upon him the necessity for the preservation of the Turkish Empire and of the sovereignty of the Sultan as Khalifa. The address which the deputation presented to the Viceroy was signed by prominent Hindu political

leaders including Gāndhiji, Swami Shradhananda, Motilal Nehru and Madan Mohan Malviya.<sup>72</sup> The Viceroy's reply to the deputation was disappointing. Consequently, the Muslim leaders issued a statement that if the peace terms would result in disfavour to Muslim religion and sentiments, they would place an undue strain upon Muslim loyalty and the statement further demanded that Arabia and the holy places of Islam should be under the control of the Khalifa and the pledges made by Lloyd George during war time should be fulfilled.<sup>73</sup> The second Sindh Khilafat Conference held on February 14, 1920 with some 15,000 representatives of Hindus and Muslims present in the meetings, declared allegiance to the Caliph and expressed utmost concern for the holy places.<sup>74</sup> The Third Khilafat Conference held at Bombay on February 15, 1920 issued a manifesto declaring that any reduction of claim would not only be a violation of the deepest religious feelings of the Muslims, but also a flagrant violation of the solemn pledges made by the British Statesmen during the war and warned the British Government against the consequence of the wrong decision particularly when not only the Muslim but also the entire Hindu population demanded the just treatment of the Khilafat.<sup>75</sup> On February 28, 1920 the Bengal Provincial Khilafat Conference emphatically declared that if the Khilafat demands were not complied with Muslims would find it difficult to keep their loyalty to the British Government intact. The Conference proposed 19th March to be observed as Khilafat Day—a day of hartal.<sup>76</sup> The Khilafat Committee, which was formed at Patna on March 7, 1920 under the leadership of Hassan Imam, also decided to observe 19th March as a Khilafat Day.<sup>77</sup> Gandhi held out threatening language towards England in a Manifesto, dated March 10, 1920 which stated that if the Muslim demands on the Khilafat wrongs were not satisfied Gandhi would lead a non-co-operation movement. Gandhi also warned the British: "England can not expect a meek submission by us to an unjust usurpation of rights which to Moslems mean a matter of life and death".<sup>78</sup> Mass meetings in support of Khilafat were held at Aligarh, Amritsar and Nagpur on March 12, 1920. The Punjab Muslims presented an address to Lieutenant-Governor on Khilafat wrong and on March 15, 1920 a Khilafat meeting was held at Delhi to protest against the anti-Turk policy of the Christian powers.<sup>79</sup>

The Khilafat Delegation headed by Mohammed Ali met Lloyd George on March 17, 1920 and intimated him that for Muslims to accept mandates over Iraq, Syria and Palestine would amount to a total disregard of the wishes of the Prophet. The results of the meeting did not satisfy the Muslims and Mohammed Ali returned empty-handed to India in October 1920.<sup>80</sup> To protest against the attitude of the British Premier and to express solidarity with Turkey, Khilafat Day followed by all India Hartal was observed on March 19, 1920. Prayers, fastings and meetings were observed throughout India. The Hindus also took part in the processions and proceedings of the Khilafat Day.<sup>81</sup> Shaukat Ali emphatically stated that if the terms of the peace treaty were not satisfactory, Muslims of India would be forced to sever their loyal connection with the British throne. Gandhiji also reiterated that in case of peace terms not acceptable to the Muslims he would launch non-co-operation movement.<sup>82</sup>

The terms of the Treaty of Sevres dismembering Turkey were announced on May 14, 1920. Although Turkey retained Constantinople, the rest of Thrace was given to Greece along with Smyrna, Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia were deta-

ched from Turkish Empire and were placed under Mandate of France and England. Hedjaz became a free and independent State, free and easy access to Mecca and Medina to Muslim pilgrims of all countries was guaranteed.<sup>83</sup> These peace terms caused the greatest indignation among the Indian Muslims and synchronising as it did with the publication of the Hunter Committee's Report, the whole country was ablaze.<sup>84</sup> The Central Khilafat Committee at a meeting at Bombay on May 20, 1920 adopted non-co-operation as the only means left to Muslims.<sup>85</sup> The All India Congress Committee in May, 1920 raised voices of complaint against the peace terms imposed on Turkey.<sup>86</sup> A mass meeting of Hindus and Muslims was held at Allahabad under the auspices of the Central Khilafat Committee on June 1, and 2, 1920 to oppose the peace terms and to consider the Khilafat and non-co-operation movement. Eminent among the Hindu leaders present in the meeting were Gandhi, Motilal Nehru, Lajpat Rai, Tej Bahadur Sapru, B.C. Pal, Madan Mohan Malviya, Satyamurti, Rajagopalachari, Jawaharlal Nehru and Chintamani. The Khilafat Committee decided non-co-operation as the only suitable means to protest against harsh terms of the treaty and a committee was appointed to chalk out the future programme. Gandhiji was the only Hindu leader who was included in the Executive Committee formed to formulate detailed programme of non-co-operation.<sup>87</sup>

Ninety prominent Muslim leaders of India sent a letter to the Viceroy on June 22, 1920, condemning the peace terms as a betrayal to the Muslims and requesting the Viceroy to exercise his influence for the revision of the peace terms. The letter warned the Government that if it failed to do the needful by August 1, 1920, the Muslims would resort to non-violent non-co-operation. "We claim", the signatories to the letter declared, "to be as loyal subjects of the Crown as any in India. But we consider our loyalty to an earthly sovereign to be subservient to our loyalty to Islam".<sup>88</sup> Gandhi gave a notice to the Viceroy on July 1, 1920 that non-co-operation would start in August 1920. After this Gandhi took upon himself the task of persuading the Congress to launch a non-co-operation movement in concert with the Khilafat Committee. To rally the people behind the Khilafat cause Gandhi went on an extensive tour of the country between August 1, and September 1, 1920.<sup>89</sup>

Muslim opinion became so much excited in India on account of the harsh terms of the treaty imposed upon Turkey that the Ulemas declared it to be derogatory for the Muslims to remain in India, a land of the enemy of Islam. Consequently a plan was embarked upon for hijrat to Islamic countries. About 18,000 people left India in the month of August, 1920 alone and went to Afghanistan,<sup>90</sup> where they were welcomed by Amanullah.<sup>91</sup> But the Afghans were soon alarmed at the heavy influx of Indian Muslims in Afghanistan because majority of them expected not only hospitality but land as well.<sup>92</sup> The Kabul Government began to dislike this influx of Indian Muslims in Afghanistan. Dismayed by their experiences in Afghanistan most of the migrants wandered back to Punjab and most of them suffered indescribable miseries and perished on the way.<sup>93</sup> This was a rude shock to the votaries of Pan-Islam amongst the Indian Muslims<sup>94</sup> and this affair hurt Amanullah's prestige in India.<sup>95</sup>

Nevertheless, the Muslims could not be disheartened in their zeal for Turkey. The Khilafat movement assumed a new dimension on August 1, 1920. The day was observed as Khilafat Day all over India.<sup>96</sup> It was on this day that Mahatma Gandhi formally inaugurated his non-co-operation movement to protest against the Khilafat

1913 the Congress expressed its grief over the subversion of the Ottoman power in Europe and the strangling of Persia.<sup>144</sup> The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* in its editorial expressed sympathy with Persia.<sup>145</sup>

By and large, Indian Muslims did not have an organised, well-planned and well-thought outlook on international problems in the first few years of the 20th century. There was an apparent absence of foreign orientation in the Muslims of India. But against this general lack of a foreign affairs orientation, however, must be noted the fact of the historical sympathy and interest of the Muslims of India for other Muslim countries of West Asia and North Africa.<sup>146</sup> Indian Muslims opened their lips whenever they saw that their co-religionists in the countries of West Asia were under troubles because they had sentimental and cultural affinity with the Muslims of these countries. Indian Muslims were loyal to the Sultan of Turkey who was the religious and spiritual head of the Muslims of the world.

Indian Muslims also came under the influence of the Pan-Islamic movement. When Abdul Hamid II started the construction of the Hedjaz Railway all the Muslim nations contributed towards the railway construction fund. Hans Kohn wrote: "Events in one part of the Mohammedan world found an echo in far distant parts. Mohammedans of all lands, especially India, contributed to the building of the Hedjaz Railway".<sup>147</sup>

Pan-Islamic feelings deepened in India in the first quarter of the 20th century so much so that two Muslim gentlemen, namely Shaikh Abdur Qadir of Lahore and Sheikh Mushir Husain Kidwai of Gadia, visited Constantinople in 1906 and received special recognition and decoration from the Sultan of Turkey. After their return to India they spared no labour to promote Pan-Islamic activities.<sup>148</sup> Indian Muslims came under the spell of Pan-Islamic movement to such an extent that in, May, 1906 Minto wrote to Morley, "There is, as you no, doubt know, a Pan-Islamic movement working in India in no friendly sense towards our rule, and even in present circumstance it will probably make itself felt".<sup>149</sup>

One of the important factors which had made the Indian Muslims loyal to the British Rule was that the latter was at friendly terms with Muslim states, especially Turkey. The deterioration in the relations between England and Turkey in the beginning of the 20th century was anxiously watched by the Indian Muslims. Indian Muslims, who had always felt alarmed at the anti-Turkish policy of the Liberal Party of England, became sore over the return of the Liberal Party in power in 1905.<sup>150</sup> Muslims in India began to review and reconsider their duty in case Great Britain and Turkey were interlocked in a war. Mian Fazl-i-Husain, who was a barrister of the Lahore High Court and a member of Viceroy's Council from 1930-35, representing the opinion of the dominant section of the Muslims in India, emphatically stated that in case of a war between England and Turkey, 95 per cent of the followers of Islam in India would repudiate their allegiance to the British Crown.<sup>151</sup> There was, however, another section of Muslims in India which refuted the claim of Fazl-i-Husain. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, who aimed at creating an Anglo-Muslim entente, declared that the Khalifa was in no way the ruler of the Muslims. Beyond doubt, the Indian Muslims were full of sympathy and reverence for the Sultan of Turkey and wished for the longevity of the Turkish Empire, but being the subjects of the King-Emperor, the Muslims of India, Mohsin-ul-Mulk

pointed out, owed their allegiance to the king alone. He further prayed for friendly relations between Turkey and Britain and observed, "If God forbid, there be a war between our Government and any Mohammedan power we should, as loyal subjects be, on the side of our own government, but as Mohammedans, we should also be sad about it".<sup>152</sup>

The year 1911 marked a turning point in the Pan-Islamic movement in India and gave a new orientation to the Indian attempts for Asian Solidarity. Frustrated and annoyed at the revocation of the partition of Bengal in 1911, the Indian Muslim were doubly shocked to hear the news of Italo-Turkish War. In 1911 Italy seized Tripolitana, then part of the Turkish Empire. Great Britain remained neutral in this war. The news that a Christian power was at war with the Caliphate aroused first among the middle-class Indian Muslims sympathy and concern for the safety of Turkey. The war produced a good deal of agitation among the Muslims in India who desired that Great Britain, which contained millions of Muslims as its subjects, should support Turkey against Italy. Hence, the British policy to remain neutral during the war caused a stir among the Indian Muslims who became anti-British in their outlook. To show their resentment over the British attitude towards the Italo-Turkish war and to express their sympathy with the Turkish people. Muslims in India held meetings, passed resolutions and prayed to God. The resentment against the unprovoked Italian invasion of Tripoli was universal and brought forth a considerable amount of explosive literature and created an awareness of the international situation among Muslims in India.<sup>153</sup> It was the U.P. Government which first of all brought to the notice of the Government of India the effects of the Italo-Turkish war on the Indian Muslims. On getting information from the U.P. Government, the Government of India directed the local governments of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, Punjab, Central Provinces and North West Frontier Province to assess the depth of anti-British sentiments caused among the Muslims by the Italo-Turkish War.<sup>154</sup> Various Muslim Organisations appealed to the Government of India to intervene in the War but the British Government declared to remain neutral. Thereupon, anti-British wave swept away the Muslims who began to think that there existed a secret Christian coalition, with which Britain was also associated, to overthrow Muslim powers all over the world.<sup>155</sup> An emergent meeting of the Council of the All India Muslim League held at Lucknow on October 7, 1911, passed resolutions sympathising with the Turkish people. The Council of the League placed on record its deep abhorrence of Italy's unjustifiable and high-handed action in Tripoli and sympathised with Turkey in her undeserved troubles and admired her magnanimity and dignified attitude throughout the crisis and appealed to the British Government to exercise its great influence as the greatest Muslim power and traditional ally of Turkey in the cause of peace to put an end to an unjust war. The Council of the League further advised the Mussalmans in India to keep a dignified attitude and place implicit confidence in the benevolence and good intentions of the British Government. The Council appealed to the Muslims to raise subscriptions for the relief of the sufferers in the war and urged the Muslims throughout the country to boycott Italian goods<sup>156</sup> of which a list was published as "*means of retaliation*".<sup>157</sup>

Numerous meetings were held all over India to express sympathy with Turkey.

On October 7, 1911 the Muslims of Detadi, district Aligarh, prayed to God for Turk's victory over Italy and expressed their sincere feelings against the unjust and hateful aggression of Italy and hoped that the British Government would prevent the progress of the conflict in the interest of Islam and the Muslim Community.<sup>158</sup> A mass meeting was held at Kanpur on November 3, 1911, to protest against Italy's actions in Tripoli and to ask the British Government to interfere and save the Turks from injury.<sup>159</sup>

Muslims of Bihar held several meetings to collect money for the Red Crescent Society but they could not collect large amount. However, they all felt that more active measures should have been made to save Turkey.<sup>160</sup> At a meeting held in Bihar the Italian invasion of Tripoli was strongly condemned and the Muslims present in the meeting took a vow to boycott Italian goods, to raise subscriptions for the Turkish sufferers and to co-operate with the Red Crescent Society to do relief work in Turkey.<sup>161</sup>

In Punjab the Muslims were very anxious about the fate of Turkey. The Punjab Muslims believed that England was in league with other European powers in destroying Turkey.<sup>162</sup> The Muslim feeling ran so high in Punjab that widespread resentment against the Government was apprehended and it was therefore that the Punjab Government wanted an early termination of the war without causing much humiliation to Turkey.<sup>163</sup> Meetings were organised in the province to express sympathy with Turkey. A mass meeting of the Mohammedans held at Lahore expressed its indignation at Italy's high-handed action in Tripoli and promised its solidarity with Turkey. The meeting also urged upon the Muslims of India to boycott Italian goods.<sup>164</sup>

The Muslims in Madras also expressed their sympathy with the Turks.<sup>165</sup> In this province some Muslims were moved so much by the tragic tale of Tripoli that they adopted retaliatory methods and indulged in physical assaults of the Christians. A disturbance took place in Changnachery in Travencore State when some Muslims apparently got out of hand after reading about the Italo-Turkish War in a local vernacular newspaper and assaulted a number of Christians.<sup>166</sup>

There was a widespread pro-Turkish feeling in the Muslim Community of Bombay. The Muslims in Bombay Presidency held several meetings to collect fund for the Red Crescent Society and made several representations to the Government against Italian atrocities in Tripoli. The province was visited by the emissaries from Turkey, Egypt and Persia who urged the Muslims to support Turkey and convinced the Bombay Muslims of British connivance with Italian atrocities in Tripoli. The papers like *Al-Hilal*, *Zamindar*, *Watan*, *Paisa Akhbar*, *Vakil* did a lot to arouse Muslim feeling in Bombay.<sup>167</sup>

In Bengal, the Muslims felt alarmed at the Italian activities in Tripoli and expressed their sympathy with Turkey and criticised British Government for her neutrality in the War. Numerous meetings were held all over Bengal to sympathise with the Turks. A branch of the Red Crescent Society was established and large amount of subscriptions was raised to help the Turks in their hours of trouble.<sup>168</sup> A largely attended mass meeting of the Mohammedans of Basirhat sub-division in Bengal expressed sympathy with the Turks engaged in war with Italy and urged upon the Muslims to boycott Italian goods and expressed sympathy for the woun-

ded and killed on the side of Turkey. About sixty rupees were collected on the spot for the relief work in Turkey. The Mussalmans of Mymensingh also expressed their heartfelt sympathy with the Turkish people.<sup>169</sup> Nearly three thousand Muslims, including leaders like Dr. Suhrawardy, Cossim Ariff and Haji Ahmad, attended a meeting at Calcutta to express sympathy with Turkey and to condemn Italian action in Tripoli.<sup>170</sup> On December 23, 1911, a mass meeting of the Muslims was held at Nehalpur, a village in the sub-division of Basirhat, district 24 Paraganas, and resolutions protesting against Italian atrocities in Tripoli and expressing sympathy with the Sultan on account of the unjust attack of Italy on Tripoli were adopted. The sympathy for the Turkish dead and wounded had become so deep that spontaneous contributions to the relief fund came forth from all sides when the meeting dispersed. Forty-eight rupees were contributed by the poor Muslims for the relief fund.<sup>171</sup>

The Muslim newspapers and pamphlets raised hue and cry over Italian invasion of Tripoli and aroused the sentiments of the Indian Muslims in favour of the Turkish people and Sultan. Important Muslim periodicals in India, notably *Al-Hilal Comrade*, *Zamindar*, *Hamdard*, and the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, supported the Turkish cause and argued for Muslim unity and solidarity.<sup>172</sup> Muhammad Iqbal, the great Muslim Poet-Philosopher of India, also lent his voice to the protest, reading a poem dedicated to the Turkish struggle in Tripoli in the mosques of India.<sup>173</sup> The Punjab Government held the *Zamindar*, *Vakil* and *Al-Muin* responsible for propagating Pan-Islamic sentiments in Punjab.<sup>174</sup> The *Zamindar* became so much popular with the Muslims that it was converted from a weekly into a daily, and its circulation went up in a large number. For its bitter attacks on Christian nations the Government considered the "*Zamindar*" as the most dangerous from the political point of view.<sup>175</sup> The *Comrade*, *Zamindar*, *Paisa Akhbar*, *Vakil*, *Al-Hilal* were widely read by the people. A Benaras Pamphlet entitled *Ur-in-Najaf* in its February issue of 1912 appealed to the Muslims to raise a handsome amount to help the Turkish people and told the Muslims not to buy the goods produced in the Christian nations and to give money to the Government for the manufacture of arms to be used against their co-religionists. This pamphlet urged the Muslims to unite against the concerted assault of the West on Islam and Turkey.<sup>176</sup> The "*Comrade*" and many other Muslim papers published special war news and they were in so much demand by the people that the "*Nama-i-Maqaddas Habl-ul-Matin*" turned from a weekly into a daily. The news flashed by these journals influenced both the educated and the general mass.<sup>177</sup> The "*Hablul-Matin*" made a passionate appeal to the Muslims to forge a united front to meet European Challenge and asked the Government of India to put an end to Italian atrocities in Tripoli.<sup>178</sup> Pro-Turkish feelings became so deep rooted in the Indian Muslim's minds that the Muslim Press warned England of the dire consequences, if she did not change her policy towards Turkey. The *Mohammadi* adopted an openly anti-European and anti-British attitude during the Italo-Turkish War and advocated boycott of Italian goods. The paper, which was famous for its Pan-Islamic leanings, received an impetus in its leanings from the war and from supposed British connivance with Italy in her atrocities in Turkey.<sup>179</sup> Another Muslim Journal entitled "*Islam Rabi*" asked the government to withdraw its notification of neutrality and allow the

Muslims to show their sympathy and love for Turkey.<sup>180</sup>

What to say of the Muslims and their press, even the Hindu Press sympathised with Turkey. But the Hindu Press adopted a moderate view. "The Tribune" denounced the Italian action in Tripoli but also deprecated the indifference of the Indian Muslims from the affairs of their own country and advised the Muslims not to boycott Italian goods. Another Hindu paper, the *Punjabee*, ridiculed the Muslims for their loyalty to the British Raj which was a fair whether friend likely to desert the Muslims after making use of them.<sup>181</sup> Of course, the Hindu papers were sympathetic towards Turkey and admitted that the Indian Muslims had a just cause for anger but unlike the Muslim papers, they did not approve of the anti-government movement on this account and asked the Indian Muslims to desist from all agitation causing embarrassment to the Government.<sup>182</sup> The Hindu papers in the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam condemned the war and justified the stand taken by the Indian Muslims but advised the Muslims to desist from boycott of Italian goods.<sup>183</sup> "The Mahratta" criticised European neutrality in face of naked aggression of Italy in Turkey. The "Political Bhomiyo" made scathing attack on the alleged conspiracy of the European powers to destroy Islam. "The Indian Social Reformer" held the view that Europeans were sympathetic to the constitutional democratic movements in Asian countries because they wanted to promote their selfish interests by fostering confusion in these countries.<sup>184</sup>

The various meetings held and numerous resolutions passed at those meetings symbolised the deep sorrow of the Indian Muslims over Italian invasion of Tripoli and the British policy of neutrality. These actions of the Indian Muslims also reflected the profound sympathy for Turkey and the deep rooted Pan-Islamic tendencies in the Indian Muslims. In fact, the Italo-Turkish war resulted in an organised and sustained Pro-Turkish movement and accentuated the Pan-Islamic tendency of the Indian Muslims.<sup>185</sup> Whereas Pro-Turkish feeling in Indian Muslims was to a degree the result of the Pan-Islamic sentiments, the sympathy expressed by Hindus and their newspapers for Turkey were the by products of the Pan-Asiatic tendency which was developing in India. To the Hindus, Turkey represented an Asiatic power and hence they expressed their solidarity with the Turks who were inter-locked in a war with a European power.

The years 1912 and 1913 gave a boost to the Pan-Islamic movement in India. Hardly the wounds of the Italian invasion had cured that Turkey was stormed by another crisis of magnitudes. Montenegro, Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia attacked Turkey. The war popularly known as the First Balkan war started in October, 1912 and continued upto May, 1913 and resulted in defeat and loss of territory to Turkey. The Turks would have been driven completely out of Europe had not the victors quarrelled among themselves over the spoils. Bulgaria, which had contributed most to the defeat of Turkey, wanted all Macedonia, a demand which did not please her allies who attacked Bulgaria and found willing helpers in the Turks. In this second Balkan war (June July, 1913) fought by Bulgaria against Greece, Serbia, Rumania and Turkey, the Turks recovered Adrianople.<sup>186a</sup> Great Britain adopted a neutral policy throughout the war, despite the repeated requests made by the Indian Muslims to intervene in the interest of Turkey. The neutral stand of Great Britain caused resentment against the British Rule and widened the scope of Pan-Islamism

in India. The Balkan wars caused widespread anxiety among the Indian Muslims as regards the British and convinced the Muslims of the Machiavellian trait in British diplomacy and they were led to feel that the British professions of friendship were insincere.<sup>186</sup> The Conquest of Morocco by France, the seizure of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria, the Italian invasion of Tripoli and the Balkan wars compelled the Indian Muslims to think that there was a sinister conspiracy amongst the Western Countries to swallow up Turkish integrity. Indian Muslims began to think that the Christian powers of Europe were determined to destroy the Ottoman Empire and the Caliphate, the last vestige of the past Islamic glory. The fate of Turkey especially excited the Indian Muslims and stimulated anti-European feelings<sup>187</sup> in their hearts. The progress of the unfortunate events in Balkan states was anxiously watched by those sections of the community which were ordinarily unmoved by political events.<sup>188</sup> The Muslims of North India eagerly watched the every move in the game in the Balkans and every reference to the subjects made by British politicians.<sup>189</sup> In fact, the Balkan wars produced intense reaction among the Indian Muslims, especially in articulate section of the Muslim Community.<sup>190</sup> The dismemberment of Turkey evoked widespread regret in which some non-Muslims also shared; the fate of Muslim states and the treatment meted out to them by Europe made the deepest and most painful impression on every mind.<sup>191</sup> The war came to be regarded as "the ultimatum of Europe's temporal aggression"<sup>192</sup> and created an atmosphere of restlessness in the Indian Muslims. The longdreaded trouble in the Balkans—"a life and death struggle between the leading Asiatic power and four minor kingdoms of Eastern Europe",<sup>193</sup> excited the Indian Muslims who held several meetings in the various parts of India and passed resolutions denouncing the Balkan States and prayed for the speedy recovery of the Porte.<sup>194</sup> "The Balkan Wars" wrote Jawahar Lal Nehru, "roused an astonishing wave of sympathy in the Muslims of India and all Indians felt that anxiety and sympathy".<sup>195</sup>

Muslims in Bihar and Orissa expressed their sympathy with the Turks and held meetings at Patna, Ranchi, Hazaribagh, Chapra and other important towns to raise subscriptions for the Turkish aid fund. Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haq in a meeting held at Bankipore on July 13, 1913 delivered an extremely inflammatory speech.<sup>196</sup> In the United Provinces the Muslim sympathy for Turkey was very widespread. On December 13, 1912 in a meeting held at Lucknow, the Aga Khan appealed to the audience to contribute to the funds opened in the aid of Turkey and he himself contributed one thousand rupees.<sup>197</sup> Sympathy for Turkey had become so deep rooted that even the Muslim students of M.A.O. College, Aligarh effected savings by curtailing their diet in order to send money to the Turks.<sup>198</sup> A society of the "Servants of Caaba" was established in Lucknow in 1913 to protect the interests of Islam throughout the world and particularly to protect the Holy cities of Islam from falling into the hands of the non-Islamic powers.<sup>199</sup> Its secretary, Shaukat Ali, also planned to send volunteers to fight on the side of Turkey.<sup>200</sup> Pro-Turkish and the anti-Christian feeling ran so high in the United Province that a number of tombstones and crosses at the Christian cemetery at Moradabad were damaged.<sup>201</sup> The agitation in favour of Turkey and against the British reached such a height that the situation in U P. seemed to be thoroughly unsatisfactory to the authorities.<sup>202</sup>

The Muslims in Bengal were much ahead than their counterparts in other pro-

vinces in their sympathy with the Turks. The British Government was severely condemned for her pro-Balkan League attitude. Some newspapers, particularly "al-Hilal," reminded the Muslims of their religious duties towards the Caliph. Sometimes even Jihad was preached.<sup>203</sup> Numerous mass meetings in support of Turkey were held and collections were made to help the Turkish people and at these meetings the speakers emphasised that the war was a struggle between Cross and Crescent.<sup>204</sup> In Calcutta alone, Muslims organised several mass meetings where anti-Turkish attitude to the British was criticised and resolutions expressing solidarity with Turkey were passed.<sup>205</sup> Anti-British feeling became so deep in the Muslims of Bengal that the more advanced sections of the Muslim Community advocated a Hindu-Muslim coalition and championed the cause of the Hindu Congress party.<sup>206</sup> It was apprehended by the Government that the Balkan War would bring the Young Muslim party closer to the Congress.<sup>207</sup>

Pro-Turkish and anti-British feeling was not so high in Madras<sup>208</sup> and in the Central Provinces,<sup>209</sup> as in other Provinces. Nevertheless the Muslims were sympathetic to the Turkish people. The Balkan war created a stir among the Punjab Muslims. The journalists, lawyers, teachers and literateurs condemned the anti-Turkish attitude of the European powers and showed their concern over the satisfaction expressed by the British ministers on the success of the Balkan allies.<sup>210</sup> In the North West Frontier Province the Pro-Turkish feeling was very feeble and sympathy for Turkey was expressed by a small section of educated men who were in close touch with the Muslim League and with Mohammed Ali and Zafar Ali, the editors of *Comrade* and *Zamindar* respectively.<sup>211</sup> The Muslims of the Bombay province were deeply shocked to learn the British hostile attitude towards Turkey and made generous contribution to the Turkish aid fund.<sup>212</sup> A public meeting of the Muslims of Bombay held under the presidentship of Currimbhoy Ebrahim and passed resolutions sympathising with Turkey.<sup>213</sup> Prayers were offered at Lahore for the victory of the Turkish arms and subscriptions were raised in aid of Turkish Relief Fund. A Muslim bank, namely Orient Bank of India proposed to sell its shares amounting to two crore rupees to the public and give the amount realised as a loan to the Turkish Government.<sup>214</sup>

Pro-Turkish and anti-British moves reached the climax in 1912 when a Medical Mission organised under Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari was sent to Turkey as a token of Indian Muslim's solidarity with Turkey. Maulana Mohammed Ali collected necessary money for the despatch of the mission to render valuable service to the suffering Turks. Indian Muslims had so deep sympathy for Turkey that even the poor subscribed to the funds of the Medical Mission.<sup>215</sup> Muslim writers and poets, Journals and Press and Muslim religious and political leaders expressed their unanimous sympathy for the Turks. Muslim Journals like the *Comrade* and the *Zamindar* strongly supported Turkey against her European adversaries and openly preached Pan-Islamism. Zafar Ali Khan, the editor of the *Zamindar*, collected money for the Turkish Red Crescent Society and proceeded to Constantinople to present the money to the Grand Vizier. For the inflammatory tone of its articles the security of his paper was confiscated by the government.<sup>216</sup> Mohammed Ali denounced the anti-Turkish policy of the British and preached the gospel of Pan-Islamism.<sup>217</sup> Indian Muslim's passionate sympathy for Turkey could be gleaned

from the fact that when the Bulgars reached near the city of Constantinople, Mohammed Ali, out of his helplessness and utter frustration at the sight of the misfortune of Islam and Turkey, thought of committing suicide.<sup>218</sup>

Anti-British feeling became such a common feature with the Indian Muslims that they lost their faith in the sincerity of the government. The British Prime Minister Lord Asquith's speech at the Guildhall banquet on November 9, 1912 in which he predicted the early fall of Turkey was bitterly criticised by the Muslim Press in India.<sup>219</sup> All the British politicians, who welcomed the success of the Balkan states, were denounced<sup>220</sup> and the statement of Lord Asquith affected the Indian Muslims profoundly. Lord Hardinge was "bombarded with telegrams of protests,"<sup>221</sup> and he was disturbed that the young Muslims were getting out of hands<sup>222</sup> and were creating a separatist tendency away from Aligarh in the minds of the moderate Muslims.<sup>223</sup> What to speak of the condemnation of the British officials, even Aga Khan's counsel of moderation published in *Times of India* on February 14, 1913 and his advice to the Muslims to bring England and Turkey closer through their loyal efforts were condemned and rejected by the young Muslims who rebuked the Aga Khan as an enemy of Islam and a slave of the British.<sup>224</sup> Maulana Azad criticised the pro-British attitude of some of the leaders of the Aligarh school and referred to them as those heretics and hypocrites who, during the last forty years, had co-operated with the satans of Europe to weaken the influence of Islamic Caliphate and Pan-Islam.<sup>225</sup> Some extremists among the Muslims advocated boycott of European goods. Leakat Hussain, a prominent Muslim leader of Calcutta, and the few other Muslim leaders of Calcutta and the few Muslim papers like *Muhammadi* and *Al-Hilal* also urged the Muslims to boycott European goods.<sup>226</sup> Timely action by the Government and the lack of organisation among the Muslims stood in the way of the successful boycott.<sup>227</sup> Some Muslims attempted to raise loans on the security of the Turkish bonds issued by the Ottoman Treasury. Mohammed Ali supported this move,<sup>228</sup> but the Government of India opposed it and dissuaded Indian ruling chiefs from accepting these bonds, for, in its opinion, there was no adequate security for the payment of money raised through them.<sup>229</sup>

Indian Muslims were assisted in their sympathy for Turkey by their Hindu brethren. Whereas the Muslims were actuated by Pan-Islamic ideas in their support and sympathy for Turkey, the Hindus in India supported the Turks because they were Asiatics. To the Hindus, the Balkan War was a struggle between an Asiatic country and European nations. Indian nationalist leaders expressed their sympathy for Turkey because she was an Asiatic power. A public meeting of the Hindus and Muslims was held at Calcutta, on November 3, 1912 to express solidarity with Turkey. Although it was a crowded meeting the Mohammedans were not largely represented. Bipin Chandra Pal presided over the meeting. Leakat Hussain addressing the meeting urged the boycott of European goods and made a fervent appeal for funds in aid of sufferers in Turkey. Dr. Abdul Gafoor, another speaker, declared that the Balkan War had threatened Islam in Europe and the duty of Muslims did not end in merely sending money to the Red Crescent Society. "The duty of the Mohammedans in Bengal, nay, the whole of India," Dr. Gafoor pointed out, "consisted in strengthening Turkey and weakening their enemies and that could only be done by boycotting European goods." Speaking on the occasion Babu Shyam

Sunder Chakravarty observed that "the decline of the political ascendancy of Turkey meant the destruction of an ancient culture and civilisation." He, however, hoped that the results of the war would have great effects on "*Asian solidarity*" and emphasised the necessity of unity between Hindus and Muslims in India. This disaster of Turkey, he emphatically stated, "would go a long way in making a solidarity among the different nations of Asia."<sup>230</sup> Bipin Chandra Pal in his presidential address declared that the meeting was a call from the Indian nationalism for Turkish nationalism and made an appeal for raising funds to help the Turks.<sup>231</sup> Hindus' support for Turkey caused a concern to the government and Hardinge in his letter to Crew informed that in Bengal Hindu "agitators" intervened "to provoke and foment Mohammedan resentment" against the British.<sup>232</sup>

The Indian National Congress also shared the sorrows of the Muslim brethren in India and expressed its concern over the fate of Turkey and emphasised the need for the peaceful settlement of the disputes. Mazhar-ul-Haq, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the twenty-seventh session of the Indian National Congress, declared that the Balkan war was not a war against the Turks but a war to turn Muslims out of Europe, a war between the Cross and Crescent and a war between the Asiatics and the Europeans.<sup>233</sup> He further criticised the British policy of indifference to the Muslim cause and pointed out that this attitude for the British ministers had deeply offended the sentiments of the seventy millions of Mussalmans of India.<sup>234</sup> Rao Bahadur R.N. Mudholkar, the president of the twenty-seventh session of the Indian National Congress, expressed profound sorrow and sympathy which the Hindus and all non-Muslim Indians felt for their Muslim brethren in the great misfortune that had overtaken the Caliphate and added that as a subject of Great Britain which was neutral in the war, it was not proper for him to take sides between the belligerents but "as staunch believers in the supremacy of the moral law and upholders of the principle of peaceful evolution, this much I believe is permissible to us to say," declared the president, "that it is possible to satisfy the just and the legitimate aspirations of the Christian provinces of the Turkish Empire without destroying the existence or the importance of Turkey or subjecting her to the humiliating condition of powerlessness."<sup>235</sup> Nawab Syed Muhammad, the president of the twenty-eight session of the Indian National Congress, also pointed out that the disastrous results caused by the Balkan War had unnerved the Indian Muslims and the dismemberment of Turkey by depriving her of her European provinces had evoked widespread regret in which non-Muslims also shared. He further declared that the defeat of Turkey, while it had caused intense grief and depression to the Islamic world, had at the same time brought Muslims closer together in a way that nothing else was capable of doing.<sup>236</sup> The intense heat of Pan-Islamic tendency did not leave the Aga Khan unmoved. Even the Aga Khan wrote in 1914 :

"For more than two years past the Moslems of India, in common with their co-religionists in other countries, have been going through the most painful experience. The Turkish loss of sovereignty in Northern Africa and in the Balkans, the continued disintegration of Persia, the treatment of Indians in South Africa, and certain matters of Indian administration, have all deeply affected Indian Moslems. The Mohammedans of India, newly awakened to national

consciousness by the education England has given them, not limited in their gaze by the vast ramparts of the Himalayas or by the waters of the Indian Ocean. There is between them and their fellow-believers in other lands essential unity, which breaks through differences of the sect and country, for it is not based on religious grounds only . ... They share the glorious heritage not only of the Koran .. but of the history and philosophy of Arabia, the incomparable poetry of Persia, the romances and legends of Egypt and Morocco and Spain. Drinking from these imperishable springs, Moslems, whether Turks, Persians, Arabi, or Indians, and whether or not they have also come to the Western walls of knowledge, are bound together by a certain unity of thought, of sentiment, and of expression.”<sup>237</sup>

Turkey also felt obliged for the immense sympathy and support expressed by the Indian Muslims. Early in 1914 Khalid Beg, the Turkish Consul-General, visited Lahore and presented to the Badshahi Mosque a carpet, sent by the Sultan of Turkey as token of his gratitude to the Muslims of India. Soon after two Turkish doctors of the Red Crescent Society visited Punjab and succeeded in pulling some Muslims to the Turkish side.<sup>238</sup>

In the beginning of 1914 it seemed that a war would break out in Europe. The Indian Muslims began to review their attitude in case of a war between Turkey and Britain. Mohammed Ali thought that in the event of a war between Britain and Turkey, he and his followers would have to take sides and that they would certainly support Turkey. When the First World War occurred and Britain declared war on Germany on August 4, 1914 the Muslims of India found themselves in a dilemma. On August 31, 1914 Mohammed Ali sent a wire to the Sultan of Turkey in which he urged the Sultan of Turkey either to support Britain or to keep neutral in this war.<sup>239</sup> Turkey joined Germany against Britain on November 4, 1914. The Muslims became puzzled and what to do was the problem before them. Mohammed Ali and his followers ranged themselves with Turkey against the British Raj. In May, 1915, Mohammed Ali and his brother Shaukat Ali were arrested for openly justifying Turkey's entry into the war against Britain and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was also placed under surveillance at Ranchi for his Pro-Turkish attitude.<sup>240</sup>

Even during the stormy days of the First World War some of the Indian nationalists did much to co-ordinate their freedom struggle with other Asian nations to get foreign assistance to wipe out the British Raj. Some of the Indian revolutionaries approached the German Government for arms and monetary assistance which was granted to them Raja Mahendra Pratap and Barakatullah along with Dr. Von Hentig, German Legation Secretary, came to Kabul and persuaded the Amir of Afghanistan to invade India. This mission, on its way to Kabul, was given grand reception in Turkey. Raja Mahendra Pratap addressed a meeting at Istanbul and the Sultan handed him a letter for the Amir of Afghanistan. Barakatullah also got a fatwa from Sheikh-ul-Islam asking the Indian Muslims to co-operate with the Hindus.<sup>241</sup> When the mission reached Afghanistan the members were lodged in quarters within Bahar Garden as the Amir of Afghanistan had promised Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy of India, that the aliens entering his kingdom would be disarmed and their activities would be restricted.<sup>242</sup> But the restrictions on the mission were lifted when the members of the mission went on hunger strike.<sup>243</sup>

While the Indian revolutionaries were making efforts to win over Afghanistan on the side of Nationalist India, some Muslim students left India in February, 1915<sup>244</sup> and proceeded to Kabul where they were detained but were released on the recommendation of Sardar Nasrullah Khan, the Afghan Amir's brother, and thereafter they came in touch with the Indian revolutionary leaders working in Afghanistan.<sup>245</sup> In August, 1915, Maulana Obeidullah Sindhi, a disciple of the Deoband School, proceeded to Afghanistan to ruin the British Government with the help of Afghanistan and became successful in enlisting support for India in Afghanistan. Obeidullah along with Mahendra Pratap, Muhammad Mian Ansari and Barkatullah held several meetings with the Amir of Afghanistan which resulted in the formation of the Provisional Government of India on December 1, 1915. Raja Mahendra Pratap became its President, Barkatullah was made Prime Minister and Obeidullah was appointed Home Minister so that when the British Government was ousted from India there would be no difficulty in taking over the administration.<sup>246</sup> This Provisional Government dealt directly with the Afghan Government and even a treaty was drawn up between the two. With the help of Sardar Nasrullah Khan, the Provisional Government organised an army of twelve hundred tribal youths for making India free.<sup>247</sup> The Afghan rulers Amir Habibullah Khan, and, to a greater extent, his successor Amamullah Khan, were secretly in sympathy with this Provisional Government of India.<sup>248</sup> Habibullah, though in sympathy with the programme of the Indian revolutionaries, maintained a neutral policy and was able to avoid any clash with the British.<sup>249</sup> This Provisional Government sent two missions, one to Japan and another to Turkey. Sheikh Abdul Kadir and Dr. Mathura Singh led the mission to Japan and Abdul Bari and Dr. Shujullah went on Turkish mission but the members of both the missions were arrested and the plan could not succeed.<sup>250</sup>

Shortly after Obeidullah left India for Kabul, Maulana Mahmud Hasan, the head Moulvi of the Deoband School, along with Mian Ansari and few others left for Hejaz to make a direct contact with the Turkish Government and to seek material help for the plan against the British Rule. During his stay at Hejaz Maulana Mahmud Hasan met the Turkish Minister of war, Anwar Pasha and General Jamal Pasha and told them about his revolutionary movement and asked them for help. At his request three documents in Arabic, Persian and Turkish signed by Anwar Pasha and Jamal Pasha were handed over to him. They had the same contents, expressed in different languages sympathising with the Indian demand for independence and promising help to it.<sup>251</sup> Mian Ansari proceeded with this document known as Ghalibnama—to Kabul and met Obeidullah there. Obeidullah wrote a long letter to Mahmud Hasan urging him to secure the active co-operation of the Turkish Government and of the Sheriff of Mecca, and describing the scheme of a Pan-Islamic army—the “Army of God”—with headquarters at Medina, and subordinate Commands at Constantinople, Tehran and Kabul. These letters were dated July 9, 1916 and were addressed to an agent in Sindh with instructions to forward by a reliable messenger to Mahmud Hasan. These letters were written on pieces of silk cloth and they were carried to India by a family servant of two students who had left Lahore and gone to Kabul. The servant met the father of the two boys with their news and the father handed over the letters to the British authorities,<sup>252</sup>

who got valuable information as to the sympathisers in India, interned about a dozen persons and took other necessary preventive steps. Thus, the Silk Letters Conspiracy, an attempt of the Indian revolutionaries to ruin the British Raj with the help of other Asian nations, came to a miserable end.<sup>253</sup>

Meanwhile Indian Muslims heard the news of the revolt of the Sheriff of Mecca against the Turkish Empire. The news caused considerable anxiety among the Muslims of India. Anxiety became more profound and vocal when it was known that the British were instrumental in bringing in this rebellion against the Turkish Empire. At first the news was not believed by the Muslims and Abdul Bari, the president of the Indian Pan-Islamists Organisation "Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba", who was a personal friend of the Grand Sheriff, disbelieved the news and with a view to verify it he proposed to send a deputation of Indian Muslims which was also to act as a peacemaker between the Arabs and the Turks but the proposal did not materialise.<sup>254</sup> Throughout India the Muslims condemned the action of the Sheriff. An emergent meeting of the Council of the All India Muslim League held at Lucknow on June 26, 1916 placed on record its deep abhorrence of the action of the Arab rebels headed by the Sheriff of Mecca and condemned them and their sympathisers as enemies of Islam.<sup>255</sup>

A public meeting was held at Lucknow on June 27, 1916 and a resolution disclaiming the report of the *Statesman*, an English owned-paper, that Indian Muslims welcomed the revolt was passed.<sup>256</sup> It was generally believed that Britain was responsible for the Sheriff's treachery and Muslims of Bombay and Calcutta disapproved of the actions of the Sheriff.<sup>257</sup> Mohammed Ali Jinnah warned the British Government not to interfere with the future of the Caliphate because this would lead to the dissatisfaction among the Muslims of India and reminded the British Government that "the loyalty of the Mussalmans of India to the Government is no small asset".<sup>258</sup>

Muslims of Delhi condemned the Sheriff for endangering the safety of the holy places by his action.<sup>259</sup> On July 6, 1916 a meeting was held under the presidency of Shamsul uléma Sayed Ahmad, who was considered to be most loyal to the British, and a resolution was passed expressing confidence that the British Government would keep to the very letter the promise with regard to the Holy Places held out to the Muslims at the beginning of the war.<sup>260</sup> The local unit of the Muslim League and the Central Mohammedan Association of Calcutta held meetings to express their views on the Arab revolt and the Muslim League passed a resolution condemning the Sheriff and his sympathisers.<sup>261</sup> At a meeting held at Dacca the Sheriff was condemned as a "traitor".<sup>262</sup> Muslim feelings in the North West Frontier Provinces and the neighbouring areas of Kanpur and Lucknow ran very high and the Government found indications of trouble in Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta.<sup>263</sup> In Lahore, a group of the Punjab Muslim League passed a resolution condemning the Sheriff's action<sup>264</sup> and the *Vakil*, *Kisan* and *Alsar* published articles condemning the Sheriff's revolt and also warned the British against lending aid to the Sheriff in maintaining his independence.<sup>265</sup> Abdul Bari, the president of the Anjuman-i-Khuddam i-Kaaba sent a telegram to the Viceroy condemning the action of the Sheriff "the impudent besieger of the tomb of the Holy Prophet and his sympathisers" who were the "enemies of Islam".<sup>266</sup> The Nizam of Hyderabad and

the Begum of Bhopal refrained from expressing their resentment at the Sheriff's action but they also did not come out in support of the Sheriff's action.<sup>267</sup>

A study of the Indian National Movement and its attitude towards Asian people during 1900 and 1918 would reveal that India evinced considerable interest in Asian countries. Of course, the Indian nationalist leaders were awefully busy with their demands for self-government and their whole energy was mobilised to secure it. Nevertheless, they did not remain aloof from the currents of developments in the Asian continent. The Indian National Congress openly criticised the British expansionist policy in Asia and expressed sympathy with Asian countries in hours of distress. Nationalist India shared the pleasure of the achievements of Japan and the latter became a model for India. India's concern for Persia, China, Burma and other Asian countries indicated the growth of Asian consciousness. Indians in general and the Muslims of India in particular stood as one man against Italy and Balkan powers when they were interlocked in war with Turkey. Beyond doubt, Indian Muslims in their sympathy with Turkey were, to a considerable degree, working under the influence of Pan-Islamic ideas and religious sentiments. But to the Hindus and to the Indian National Congress Turkey was an Asiatic power and thus while championing the cause of Turkey they thought of championing the cause of Asia against Europe. In other words, in Indian atmosphere pan-Islamism was converted into Pan-Orientalism by the Indian nationalists. Thus, Asianism as a marked feature of Indian nationalist thinking had emerged during the years 1900-18.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>Surendra Nath Banerjee, *Speeches of Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee*, Vol. VI. (Calcutta, 1908) p. 327.
- <sup>2</sup>Gopal Krishna Gokhale, *Speeches of the Honourable G. K. Gokhale* (Madras, 1920) p. 915.
- <sup>3</sup>*Report of the Twenty-First Indian National Congress*, (1905), p. 13.
- <sup>4</sup>Lord Hardinge, *My Indian Years : Reminiscences*, (London, 1948), p. 115
- <sup>5</sup>Lady Minto, *India, Minto and Morley (1905-1910)*, (London, 1935), p. 298.
- <sup>6</sup>Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, *Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought* (Calcutta, 1958) pp. 63-123.
- <sup>7</sup>M.A. Buch, *Rise and Growth of Indian Militant Nationalism* p. 25.
- <sup>8</sup>Bal Gangadhar Tilak, *Two Remarkable Speeches* (Sylhet, 1907) p. 6.
- <sup>9</sup>Bal Gangadhar Tilak, *Writings and Speeches* (Madras, 1907) p. 56
- <sup>10</sup>W.T. de Bary, *Sources of Indian Tradition*, p. 722.
- <sup>11</sup>B.C. Pal, *Speeches Delivered at Madras* (Madras, 1907) p. 21.
- <sup>12</sup>Lajpat Rai, "The Coming Indian National Congress—Some Suggestions" *Kayastha Samachar*, November 1901, pp. 376-85.
- <sup>13</sup>Lajpat Rai, "The Principles of Political Congress", *East and West*, August, 1902, Vol. I. p. 1040.
- <sup>14</sup>*Punjab Native Newspaper Reports 1900-1921*, *Paisa Akbhar*, December 12 and 13, 1905.
- <sup>15</sup>*Report of the Sedition Committee, 1918*, Chapter 11.
- <sup>16</sup>Surendranath Banerjee, *A Nation in Making*, p. 187.
- <sup>17</sup>*Report of the Twenty Second Indian National Congress*, p. 83.
- <sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 87-89.
- <sup>19</sup>N.C. Sen Gupta, "The Boycott Movement", *The Indian Review*, May, 1909, p. 351.
- <sup>20</sup>*Report of the Twenty Second Indian National Congress*, p. 83.
- <sup>21</sup>*The Bengalee*, December 7, 1907.
- <sup>22</sup>Aurobindo Ghose, *An Open Letter to His Countrymen*, p. 4.
- <sup>23</sup>C.Y. Chintamani, *Indian Politics Since the Mutiny* (London, 1940) p. 79.
- <sup>24</sup>S. Bhima Sankara Roy, *The 22nd Indian National Congress*, 1907, I.O.L. Tract, 1028.
- <sup>25</sup>Ambika Charan Majumdar, *Indian National Evolution*, pp. 108-24. See M.R. Jayakar, *The Story of My Life*, Vol. I (Bombay, 1958) p. 82.
- <sup>26</sup>N.V. Rajkumar, *Development of the Congress Constitution* (New Delhi, All India Congress Committee, 1949) pp. 14-15.
- <sup>27</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, p. 87.
- <sup>28</sup>R.S. Wasti, *Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement, 1905-1910*, (Oxford, 1964) p. 29.
- <sup>29</sup>Quoted in B.N. Pandey
- <sup>30</sup>H.G. Rawlison, in *The British Achievement in India* (London, 1948) pp. 185-86.
- <sup>31</sup>Lady Minto, *India, Minto and Morley*, p. 47.
- <sup>32</sup>Afzal Iqbal, (ed) *Select Writings and Speeches of Maulana Muhammad Ali* (Lahore, Ashraf, 1944) p. 255.
- <sup>33</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, pp. 112-13.
- <sup>34</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 4, 1906.
- <sup>35</sup>John Buchan, *Lord Minto : A Memoir*, p. 224.
- <sup>36</sup>Morley's letter to Minto, dated October 26, 1906, Lady Minto, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48.
- <sup>37</sup>M.S. Jain, *The Aligarh Movement, its Origin and Development*, pp. 153-54.
- <sup>38</sup>S. Razi Wasti, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
- <sup>39</sup>Lady Minto, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48.
- <sup>40</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-15.
- <sup>41</sup>Ramsay MacDonald, *Awakening of India*, p. 176.
- <sup>42</sup>B.L. Grover, *British Policy Towards Indian Nationalism*, p. 88.
- <sup>43</sup>AB. Rajput, *Muslim League Yesterday and Today*, (Lahore, Ashraf, 1948) pp. 19-20.
- <sup>44</sup>S.R. Mehrotra, *India and the Common Wealth*, p. 181.
- <sup>45</sup>Nawab Viquar-ul-Mulk's statement, Cited in Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims: A Political History*, pp. 101-2.

- <sup>46</sup>Report of the Twenty-Ninth Indian National Congress, 1914, p. 1.
- <sup>47</sup>Chowdhury Khaliqzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan* (1961) p. 28.
- <sup>48</sup>Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918 (London, 1918) p. 5.
- <sup>49</sup>Valentine Chirol, *India, Old and New* (London, 1921) pp. 159-60.
- <sup>50</sup>Andrews and Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-61.
- <sup>51</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *Pakistan : The Formative Phase 1857-1958*, (1968) p. 45.
- <sup>52</sup>*Ibid.* p. 39.
- <sup>53</sup>*The Times of India*, December 30, 1916, January 1 and 2, 1917.
- <sup>54</sup>Sukumar Rajan Das, "Tagore and Indian Nationalism", *Indian Review*—Vol. XXXV, 1944, p. 10.
- <sup>55</sup>Sisir Kumar Mitra, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
- <sup>56</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
- <sup>57</sup>Cited in Sisir Kumar Mitra, *op. cit.*, 251.
- <sup>58</sup>Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, *Sixty Years of Congress*, p. 152.
- <sup>59</sup>Report of the Proceedings of the Nineteenth Indian National Congress, 1903, (1904) p. 24.
- <sup>60</sup>*India*, No. 309 (New Series), December 4, 1903.
- <sup>61</sup>Report of the Twentieth Indian National Congress, 1904, p. 44.
- <sup>62</sup>Lord Curzon in *India-Speeches*, Vol. II. (London, 1906) p. 222.
- <sup>63</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, February 18, 1905.
- <sup>64</sup>Sukumar Ranjan Das, "Tagore and Indian Nationalism", *Indian Review*; Vol. XXXV, 1944, p. 10.
- <sup>65</sup>*The Hindustan Review and Kayastha Samachar*, Vol. IX (New Series, Allahabad, 1904) p. 299.
- <sup>66</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. VI, 1905, p. 272.
- <sup>67</sup>Cited in R.P. Dua, *The Impact of the Russo-Japanese (1905), War on Indian Politics* (New Delhi, 1966) p. 23.
- <sup>68</sup>*The Bangalee*, March 26, 1905.
- <sup>69</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Glimpses of the World History* (New York, 1942) p. 834.
- <sup>70</sup>J.L. Nehru, *An Autobiography* (New Delhi, 1962) p. 16.
- <sup>71</sup>D.G. Karve, (ed) *Speeches and Writings of Gopal Krishan Gokhle*, Vol. II. (Bombay, 1966). p. 178.
- <sup>72</sup>G.K. Gokhle, "Self-Government for India", *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, New Series 3, XXII, 1906, p. 243.
- <sup>73</sup>Gopal Krishna Gokhle, *Speeches of the Hon'ble G.K. Gokhle*, p. 819.
- <sup>74</sup>B.G. Tilak, *Writings and Speeches*, p. 330.
- <sup>75</sup>Ram Gopal, *Lokmanya Tilak : A Biography* (Bombay, 1956) p. 285.
- <sup>76</sup>Vartan Gregorian, *The Emergence of Modern Afghanistan*, (1969) p. 209.
- <sup>77</sup>D. Mackenzie Brown, *Indian Political Thought : From Ranade to Bhave* (1961), pp. 8-9, and 72.
- <sup>78</sup>Paul F. Power, *Gandhi on World Affairs*, pp. 56-57.
- <sup>79</sup>Chamanlal, *Secrets of Japan* (1937), p. 20.
- <sup>80</sup>Lovett, *A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement* (London, 1921), p. 237.
- <sup>81</sup>Viscount Morley, *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 154.
- <sup>82</sup>R.G. Pradhan, *India's Struggle for Swaraj*, p. 75.
- <sup>83</sup>C.F. Andrews, *The Renaissance in India*, (London, 1912), p. 4.
- <sup>84</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
- <sup>85</sup>*The Daily Hitavadi*, June 12, 1905.
- <sup>86</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 14, 1905.
- <sup>87</sup>*The Sultan* (Calcutta), March 24, 1905.
- <sup>88</sup>Pratijna, Cited in R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.
- <sup>89</sup>*The Bangalee*, February 8, 1905.
- <sup>90</sup>Quoted in Lancelot Lawton, *Empire in the Far East*, Vol. II (London, 1912) p. 806.
- <sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*

- <sup>92</sup>Congress Presidential Addresses, 1911-1934, Second Series, pp. 311-12.
- <sup>93</sup>Report on the Native Newspapers of Bengal, p. 587.
- <sup>94</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>95</sup>Valentine Chirol, *India*, p. 113.
- <sup>96</sup>R.C. Majumdar, "The Genesis of Extremism", *The Studies in the Bengal Renaissance* (ed) by Atulchandra Gupta, (Jadavpur, 1958) p. 201.
- <sup>97</sup>Lovett, *A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement*, p. 229.
- <sup>98</sup>John Cumming (ed), *Political India*, p. 54 and 228.
- <sup>99</sup>R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- <sup>100</sup>Tripura Hitaishi (Comilla), June 20, 1905, in *Report on the Native Newspapers of Bengal*, pp. 632-33.
- <sup>101</sup>Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
- <sup>102</sup>*The Bengalee*, June 12, 1905.
- <sup>103</sup>Sant Nihal Singh, "Indian Students in Japan," *Indian Review*, September 1906, p. 673.
- <sup>104</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>105</sup>Valentine Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, p. 148.
- <sup>106</sup>R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
- <sup>107</sup>*The Indian Review*, July, 1906, p. 550.
- <sup>108</sup>Ram Gopal, *Lokmanya Tilak*, p. 233
- <sup>109</sup>*The Japan Weekly Mail*, May 5, 1906.
- <sup>110</sup>Shun Saitoh (ed) *Japan and India* (Kyobashi Tokyo, 1912), pp. 220-27.
- <sup>111</sup>James A.B. Scherer, *Japan's Advance* (Tokyo, 1934) pp. 99-102.
- <sup>112</sup>Shun Saitoh, (ed) *Japan and India*, p. 300.
- <sup>113</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. VIII, June 1907, p. 480.
- <sup>114</sup>*The Bengalee*, June 15, 1905.
- <sup>115</sup>Ramananda Chatterjee, (ed), *Towards Home Rule* (Calcutta, 1917) Part I, p. 147.
- <sup>116</sup>Ibid., p. 148.
- <sup>117</sup>Cited in *East* (Calcutta) July 16, 1905.
- <sup>118</sup>Lancelot Lawton, *op. cit.*, p. 807.
- <sup>119</sup>*Sanjivani*, (Calcutta), November 27, 1905.
- <sup>120</sup>Ramananda Chatterjee (ed), *Towards Home Rule*, Part II, pp. 97-98.
- <sup>121</sup>Shun Saitoh, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
- <sup>122</sup>*The Japan Weekly Mail*, April 7, 1906.
- <sup>123</sup>*The Bengalee*, January 12, 1905.
- <sup>124</sup>*The Japan Weekly Mail*, April 78, 1906.
- <sup>125</sup>Ibid., May 26, 1906.
- <sup>126</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>127</sup>Quoted in Lancelot Lawton, *op. cit.*, p. 805.
- <sup>128</sup>Quoted in R.P. Dua, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- <sup>129</sup>Ibid., p. 49.
- <sup>130</sup>Ogata Taketora, "Mitsuru Toyama", *Contemporary Japan*, July 1940, Vol. IX, No. 7, p. 819.
- <sup>131</sup>Valentine Chirol, *op. cit.*, p. 147.
- <sup>132</sup>M.M. Ahluwalia, *Freedom Struggle in India, 1858-1909* (Delhi, 1965) p. 204.
- <sup>133</sup>Irving S. Friedman, "Indian Nationalism and the Far East," *Pacific Affairs*, No. XIII, March, 1940, p. 18.
- <sup>134</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>135</sup>D.B. Mathur, *Gokhale, A Political Biography*, pp. 210-19.
- <sup>136</sup>Ruchi Ram Sahni, *The Awakening of Asia* (Lahore, 1929) p. 28.
- <sup>137</sup>D.N. Verma, "Indian and Asian Solidarity, 1900-1939," *J.B.R.S.*, Vol. XLIX, 1963, p. 319.
- <sup>138</sup>Rajani Palm Dutt, *India Today*, (Bombay, 1947), p. 445.
- <sup>139</sup>Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan*, (1963) p. 54.

to foster closer political understanding between themselves.<sup>225</sup> Amanullah's pan-Islamic and anti-British policies won him general applause in India and Muhammed Iqbal, the great Indian poet philosopher, dedicated his famous poem Payam-i-Mushriq (The Message of the East) to the Afghan Amir.<sup>226</sup>

King Amanullah introduced a number of social, economic, educational, military and cultural reforms in Afghanistan and gave a new constitution to the Afghan people. Like Kemal Pasha, King Amanullah wanted to make Afghanistan a progressive and modern state.<sup>227</sup> Indian people viewed these developments with satisfaction. The All India Muslim League at its session at Calcutta in December, 1928 placed on record its sincere and warm appreciation of the splendid efforts that were being made by Amanullah to make Afghanistan a great and progressive country.<sup>228</sup>

In December, 1927, King Amanullah along with Queen Souriya and an official party set out on a tour of Europe *via* India. His visit to India evoked a widespread enthusiasm among the Indian people. On the news that the Afghan King would come to India, Maulana Shaukat Ali appealed to all Congress, Khilafat, Muslim League and other nationalist organisations and all public men to wire to Amanullah "messages of welcome and good will to show our neighbourly friendly feelings towards the good king of Afghanistan...with whom we the people of India desire to live at peace and amity".<sup>229</sup>

King Amanullah reached Bombay on December 9, 1927 and was accorded a warm reception by the Indian people. The Afghan King wanted to meet imprisoned Gandhi but the British Government did not allow him to see the Indian leader. While in India king Amanullah delivered frequent speeches calling for Hindu-Muslim Unity,<sup>230</sup> and spoke of Islamic solidarity and was in turn hailed as the King of Islam.<sup>231</sup> Amanullah urged his co-religionists in India to free themselves from the control of the Mullahs. "I would urge you once again," said the Afghan King, "and warn you over and over again, not to be led away by fanaticism or by ignorant Mullahs. Be careful. Work out your own Salvation".<sup>232</sup>

Amanullah's visit to India aroused widespread nationalist and pan-Islamic sentiment in India. Mohammed Shafi, the President of the All India Khilafat Conference held at Madras in December, 1927, welcomed the visit of the King of Afghanistan and supported the Afghan King's suggestion for an Asiatic League. Speaking on the occasion Maulana Shaukat Ali declared that Amanullah was going to Europe to gain knowledge and experience with a view to start an Asiatic League and wished him success in his endeavours.<sup>233</sup>

This enthusiasm for the Afghan King was not confined to the Muslims alone, it was shared by the Hindus too. The All India Hindu Mahasabha held at Madras in December, 1927, tendered its respectful and profound thanks to king Amanullah for the very king regard shown by him to Hindu religious feeling in the matter of respect for the cow and for the advice which he gave to the Mussalmans of India to respect Hindu sentiments in this matter.<sup>234</sup>

Amanullah's liberal reforms antagonised the orthodox Afghans who began the attempt to sabotage the reforms introduced by Amanullah. Indians viewed these developments in Afghanistan with alarm and anxiety. The All India Muslim League in 1928 appreciated the liberal reforms introduced by Amanullah and condemned the actions of the rebels and those who were creating troubles for the King and

expressed its hope that Amanullah would become successful in crushing the rebellion and in his scheme to place Afghanistan in the front rank of the nations of the world.<sup>235</sup> In the meeting of the Subjects Committee of the Indian National Congress held in December, 1928, Basheer Ahmed made an abortive attempt to record a resolution to congratulate Amanullah on his attempt to modernise Afghanistan. But, Sir Prakash opposed the resolution and stated that the Afghan King did not deserve congratulations of India, if he shot down people to compel them to wear hats and shave off their beards.<sup>236</sup> However, sympathy admiration for Amanullah's modernising efforts were not lacking in India. A message was sent to Queen Souriya of Afghanistan by the students and the staff of the Kanya Mahavidyala, Jullundur (Girls College, Jullundur) appreciating the reforms which were being introduced in Afghanistan affecting the general weal of Womankind there.<sup>237</sup>

The various reforms introduced by Amanullah were disliked by the orthodox Afghans and widespread uproar against the reforms started in Afghanistan.<sup>238</sup> Anti-Government demonstrations were held and one Bacha i-Saqo organised an army and captured Kabul. Thereupon, Amanullah abdicated the throne in January, 1929 in favour of his brother Inayatullah but mounting pressures of Bacha compelled Inayatullah also to abdicate. Bacha proclaimed himself the ruler of the country, cancelled all the reforms of Amanullah and promised to establish the rule of Islamic Law in all its purity.<sup>239</sup>

Indians watched these developments with great concern. Jawaharlal Nehru pointed out that all Congressmen had been following with the keenest anxiety the happenings in Afghanistan and they had felt sympathy for Afghan gallant King.<sup>240</sup> The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress at its meeting in Delhi in February, 1929, noted with grave concern the internal troubles in Afghanistan and the reactionary attempts made there to put an end to the reforms introduced by Amanullah. The Committee whole heartedly sympathised with the progressive elements in their endeavour to make Afghanistan a united and progressive nation.<sup>241</sup> Dr. Satyapal, the President of the Punjab Provincial Political Conference held on March 8, 1929, expressed sympathy with Amanullah.<sup>242</sup> The U.P. Political Conference held on April 1, 1929, expressed pleasure at the success of Amanullah and the progressive elements in Afghanistan and hoped that they would soon win through.<sup>243</sup> The Bengal Provincial Conference held on April 2, 1929, expressed its sympathy with Amanullah in his difficulties and prayed for his immediate restoration to throne to enhance the glory of Afghanistan and all Asia.<sup>244</sup>

The British India Government was also criticised for its alleged sympathy with the rebels against Amanullah. Officially, British India Government maintained neutrality throughout the Afghan turmoil but the British instigated split and internal quarrel among the Afridis and Orakzais, the two tribes on the British side of the Durand Line, who were sympathetic to Amanullah and thus prevented aid from reaching Amanullah. One Mullah Mahmud Akhundzada, who played a dominant role in creating split among the tribes, was generally regarded as a British agent on the border for preventing the tribes from giving aid to Amanullah against his rivals.<sup>245</sup> Thus attitude on the part of the British towards Afghan turmoil caused considerable agitation within India and mass meetings in many cities like Bombay and Lahore were organised and a number of petitions asking the government for permission

to take part in "*Amanullah Days*" were made. On January 7, 1929 the government had to invoke its police powers to prevent any accusations of complicity from appearing in the Indian papers.<sup>246</sup> An overcrowded meeting was held in the Albert Hall, Calcutta, to express sympathy with Amanullah and Sir P. C. Roy, who moved the main resolution, pointed out that vast majority of the audience consisted of the Hindus.<sup>247</sup> The "*Amrita Bazar Patrika*" condemned Nadir Khan, one of the rivals of King Amanullah, for his anti-Amanullah activities and expressed its indignation at the policy of the British India Government in allowing those persons to go to Afghanistan *via* India, who are causing so much unrest in Afghanistan although the Government of India pretended to be strictly neutral.<sup>248</sup>

Zafar Ali Khan, in his message to Nadir Khan, appealed to Nadir Khan's good sense to think twice before taking an irrevocable step which would plunge Afghanistan into trouble. Indians as well as all right thinking Afghans wrote Zafar Ali Khan and wanted Amanullah back.<sup>249</sup> Giving an estimate of the sympathy the Indians had for the liberal Afgan King Amanullah, the *Modern Review* of February, 1929 wrote that there was general desire among Indians for the re-establishment of King Amanullah on the throne of Afghanistan and for prosperity and full freedom of that country. It further wrote: "Indians, irrespective of race and religion, were among his admirers and well-wishers".<sup>250</sup> Amanullah's image in India remained untarnished even after his downfall. In an interview with the "*Associated Press*" on February 19, 1929, Aga Ahmed Khan called Amanullah "*an ideal ruler*" and "*a patriotic king*."<sup>251</sup>

In 1920's informed public opinion in India became more conscious of the Asian neighbours and the country which aroused most the interest of the Indian people was China struggling hard to maintain her political entity and territorial integrity against the heavy onslaughts of the Western imperialists. Tradition of long friendly relations between India and China followed by the common problems that confronted them created a new sense of relationship between these two nations. Fighting as they were for their own independence the Indian nationalists realised that the Chinese also must not be denied the right to have their own say in their own houses. As the Indians and the Chinese were engaged in more or less the same pursuit "out of this common struggle against imperialism", wrote P.C. Chakravarti, "emerged new desire to help each other and learn from each other".<sup>252</sup> The progress of the Chinese nationalist revolution during 1925-27 awakened an enthusiastic response in India.<sup>253</sup> In their attempt to get rid of the clutches of the Western imperialists, especially Great Britain, the Chinese nationalists launched a boycott movement which posed a serious threat to the British economic stronghold over China. Indian nationalists did not simply watch the Chinese boycott movement; they also inspired, to some extent, the Chinese nationalists. It had been suggested that the Chinese boycott of British goods was influenced by the Indian Civil Disobedience Movement of 1920-21<sup>254</sup>. Sun Yat Sen, the great Chinese leader, in his lecture on the methods of nationalism, which was later incorporated into his Three People's Principles, admitted that the Indian non-co-operation movement had been a lesson for the Chinese nationalist movement and urged the Chinese people to boycott the British goods as people had done in India.<sup>255</sup>

As India constituted the main base to sustain British imperialism in Asia,

Indian resources in men and money were always used to protect British interests in Asia and whenever there arose a nationalist movement in any part of Asia threatening the existence of British domination Indian soldiers were sent to crush that movement. Indian nationalists considered it as a misfortune that while they were themselves fighting for independence, the Indian soldiers should fight against nationalist struggles in other parts of the globe. When the Chinese launched a widespread boycott of British goods the British India Government saw a danger to its own economic interests in this boycott movement in China. To suppress that movement the British Government of India sent Indian troops to China. In 1925, Gandhi received a cable from the Commissioner of Foreign Affairs of the National Government of China complaining against the use of Indian soldiers for shooting the innocent Chinese people at the behest of the Government of India. Indian public opinion which was opposed to the use of Indian men and money for that annihilation of nationalist movement in any part of the world, took up the cause of China and Gandhi, who had emerged as an undisputed leader in India by that time, described the use of Indian troops in China a humiliating and shocking spectacle, if true, and assured the Chinese that if Indians had any voice in the determination of the policy of the government they would not have tolerated such a thing.<sup>256</sup> The All India Congress Committee at its meeting at Patna in September, 1925 expressed its sympathy with the Chinese in their struggle for maintaining political entity of China and strongly protested against the despatch of Indian troops to China.<sup>257</sup>

Public opinion in India became more critical of the policies of the Government of India when the latter sent additional Indian troops to China to crush the widespread Chinese nationalists' urge for freedom. Although the Government of India sent the troops to China on the ground that they were being sent to protect the lives of the British residents from the fury of the revolutionaries but the Indian people smelt rat behind the despatch of Indian troops to China and availed of the opportunity to assert their solidarity with the Chinese people. On January 26, 1927, the Congress leader, Srinivas Iyengar moved an adjournment motion in the Legislative Assembly to know whether there was any special arrangement between the Imperial and the Indian Government as to the payment of the cost of despatch of the expedition to China from India and he asked whether the Government of India was entitled to send troops without consulting the legislature.<sup>258</sup> On January 27, 1927, S. Satyamurti moved an adjournment motion in the Madras Legislative Council to urge upon the Government of Madras to represent to the Government of India the opinion of the House that it wholly disapproved of the action of the Government of India in sending Indian troops to China as it was without reference to the Legislative Assembly.<sup>259</sup>

A mass meeting of the citizens of Delhi was held on January 28, 1927, to protest against the despatch of Indian troops to China against the wishes of the Indian people. Among the distinguished audience were Tej Bahadur Sapru, Saklatwala, Moti Lal Nehru, Srinivas Iyengar, Mohammed Ali, Asaf Ali and Ramaswami Iyengar. This meeting of the citizens of Delhi expressed sympathy for the Chinese people in their national aspirations and in their efforts to realise them and emphatically condemned the action of the Government of India in despatching Indian

troops to China against the wishes of the Indian people and without consulting their representatives in the legislature.<sup>260</sup> In an interview with Chapala Kant Bhattacharya on January 30, 1927, Rabindranath Tagore, expressed his condemnation of the British policy of sending Indian troops to China and characterised the expedition of the English against China as a crime against humanity and regretted that to the utter shame of Indians, India was being used as a pawn in the game. "Enslaved as we are", observed Tagore, "to our utter shame, we are being used as instruments for forging fetters for other people. In a crusade against justice, freedom and morality where the English are the aggressors India is being dragged into the field against her own will."<sup>261</sup>

India's sympathy for China was so widespread and universal that the people belonging to every walk of life expressed their solidarity with China and resented the despatch of Indian troops to crush the rising national spirit in China. On January 31, 1927, "Hindu Congress Extremists"<sup>262</sup> held a meeting in Delhi and condemned the Government of India for despatching Indian troops to China. The students of Visvabharati in a meeting on January 31, 1927 passed a resolution expressing sympathy with China in her struggle for freedom and internal peace. The meeting considered the policy of the British Government in sending Indian troops to China as condemnable as this was detrimental to the growth of friendly and cultural relations between India and China.<sup>263</sup> Commenting upon the despatch of Indian troops to China Gandhi wrote : "Our helplessness becomes never so apparent as when Indian soldiers are shamelessly used to crush other people's freedom. Indeed India is key to the exploitation of the Asiatic and other non-European races of the earth. She is held under bondage not merely for the sake of her own exploitation but that of her neighbours, near and distant. Here then there is an outlook which no self respecting Indian can accept."<sup>264</sup>

Assuring the Chinese of the Indian sympathy and expressing India's helplessness, Gandhiji told the Chinese that Indian soldiers had gone to China only because Indians were more helpless than the Chinese but he trusted that China would come out successful of this muddy state of affairs.<sup>265</sup> Mohammed Ali in a statement issued on February 3, 1927 expressed his profound sympathy for China and declared that he would lay himself down before train carrying Indian soldiers to fight against China.<sup>266</sup> In a protest meeting held at Calcutta on February 5, 1927, the citizens of Calcutta regarded the despatch of Indian troops to China as an act of imperialism and recorded their emphatic protest against the policy of the Government of India.<sup>267</sup> The Working Committee of the Akali Dal at its meeting in Amritsar passed a resolution expressing sympathy with the Chinese people.<sup>268</sup> The Bombay Provincial Congress Committee in a meeting on February 7, 1927 condemned the British policy in China and granted a sum of rupees 151 for demonstrations to be held in all wards of the city against the despatch of Indian troops to China.<sup>269</sup> The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress in February, 1927 expressed its dissatisfaction on the arguments used by the British Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister as to the necessity of sending troops to China and demanded that the Indian troops sent there be brought back to India forthwith and called upon the country to insist on the Government's compliance with the demand.<sup>270</sup> The Central Committee of the All India Khilafat Conference at its meeting held at Lucknow on February 26, 1927 expressed its full sympathy with the Chinese

struggle for freedom and condemned the British Government for sending Indian troops to China.<sup>271</sup>

As Indian people were not free to decide their course of action they could not do more than expressing their solidarity with the Chinese people. The seventh session of the All India Trade Union Congress held on March 12, 1927 at Delhi under the patronage of Srinivas Iyengar, Lajpat Rai and Madan Mohan Malviya, protested against the despatch of Indian troops to China and called upon the Government of India to call back all Indian troops from China.<sup>272</sup> The *Forward* in its editorial under the caption "*China and India*" maintained that the sympathy of India for China in her struggle for freedom was deep and sincere and noted with concern the despatch of Indian troops to China to play the part of hired assassins and described it as an outrage on Indian feeling.<sup>273</sup> The same daily assured the Chinese that theirs would be the ultimate victory,<sup>274</sup> and expressed sympathy with the Chinese people and also regretted the helplessness of the Indians in doing nothing to prevent this outrage.<sup>275</sup> The annual session of the Bengal Provincial Conference held in April, 1927, dissociated itself from the military policy of the British Government. While it disapproved of the policy of the government, it assured the Chinese of the sympathy and goodwill of the Indian people in their hour of trial.<sup>276</sup> The Kerala Provincial Conference held at Calicut on April 16, 1927 expressed its heartfull sympathy with the people of China in their struggle for freedom and placed on record the sense of humiliation and resentment of the people of India at the action of the British Government in compelling India to be a party to her unworthy imperial adventures in China.<sup>277</sup> The tenth session of the All India Hindu Mahasabha at its meeting at Patna in April, 1927, desired an early termination of the civil war in China and expressed concern over the attempts of the foreigners in that land to crush the new Chinese spirit of independence.<sup>278</sup> The Andhra Provincial Congress in its meeting in May, 1927, resolved that the All India Congress Committee should make a donation of not less than ten thousand rupees to the Cantonese Government as a mark of protest against the action of the Government of India calculated to obstruct Chinese independence. It further requested all village and district Congress committees to show their sympathy towards the Chinese by making liberal donations.<sup>279</sup>

Realising fully the spirit of the Indian people the All India Congress Committee in May 1927, assured the Chinese of its fullest sympathy in their struggle for freedom and condemned the Government of India for despatching Indian troops to China and demanded their immediate withdrawal from there.<sup>280</sup> The Committee also appreciated the proposal of the Hindustani Seva Dal to send an ambulance corps to China and appealed to the country to give its moral and material support to this humanitarian work for a friendly nation. It also called upon the All India Board of the said Dal to take all necessary steps in that direction.<sup>281</sup> Commenting upon this gesture of goodwill the *Forward* wrote in its editorial that "the Hindustan Seva Dal's project of sending an ambulance corps to China on a medical mission would prove the sincere love and sympathy. The Indians had for the Chinese people. All the overpowering feelings of admiration and sympathy which Indians entertained for the Chinese nation in its hour of glory and peril had, for want of any proper channel for natural outflow, been enshrined in this small project," the paper concluded <sup>282</sup> T.C. Goswami, the President of the All India Volunteer Board,

tried to secure the necessary passports for the Medical Mission but the Government of India refused to grant the necessary passports on the ground that the Mission had certain definite political purposes. And thus the plan could not materialise.<sup>283</sup>

The U.P. Political Conference at its 21st session at Aligarh on November 25, 1927 expressed sympathy with China and emphatically protested against the despatch of Indian troops to China.<sup>284</sup> The Forty-Second session of the Indian National Congress held at Madras in 1927 unanimously condemned British refusal to issue necessary passports to the Indian Medical Mission to be sent to China and sent its warmest greetings to the people of China. It assured them of its full sympathy in their fight for emancipation. The Congress noted with grave concern the despatch of Indian troops to China to further British imperialist designs and to hinder and prevent the people of China from attaining their freedom. It further demanded the immediate withdrawal of all Indian troops and police forces from China and advised Indians not to go to China in future as agents of the British Government to fight or work against the Chinese people, who were the comrades of the Indian people in their just struggle against imperialism.<sup>285</sup>

Jawaharlal Nehru was full of sympathy for China and desired an intimate relation between China and India. Speaking at the Punjab Provincial Conference held on April 11, 1928 Jawahar Lal Nehru told the Punjabis that their gallant soldiers had been exploited enough in the past not in India alone but in the four quarters of the world. Even at the time they were made to "do the dirty work of British imperialism in China"<sup>286</sup> which had done no harm to the Indians. "It was the time," Jawahar Lal concluded, "Indians should put an end to this shameful exploitation of the courage of Indian manhood."<sup>287</sup> In the World Youth Peace Congress held in Holland in August, 1928 the Indian Youth delegation expressed concern over the fate of China and criticised British Policy in China.<sup>288</sup> The 43rd session of the Indian National Congress held at Calcutta in 1928 congratulated the people of China on their having attained their full and complete freedom and nationhood and having ended the era of foreign domination of their country. It also expressed its solidarity with China.<sup>289</sup>

Nationalist leaders in China were also full of sympathy for the Indian people in their struggle for freedom. Madam Sun Yat Sen, who wanted to attend the Congress session in 1928, could not attend the session because the British Government refused to grant passport to her. In a letter to the Congress Madam Sun Yat Sen declared that this petty act, however, would not prevent her from sending a message to assure Indian people that the cause of Indian independence "continues to command the interest and sympathy of all true followers of Sun Yet Sen who died wishing success of the Indian nation in the struggle for freedom, and who looked upon that struggle as a part of the larger movement of Asia towards the social readjustments rendered necessary by the material developments of the West."<sup>290</sup> Continuing she advised the Indian leaders that if Indian independence was to be realised they must secure the wide and active support of the masses of the workers and peasants of India.<sup>291</sup> The Indian National Congress, which spearheaded the nationalist movement in India, did not have a well-thought and well-knit foreign policy before 1920. In November, 1921 the All India Congress Committee

passed a resolution which was the formal declaration of independence from the British foreign policy and that was the first formulation of the foreign policy which a free and Independent India would like to adopt. Through the resolution the Congress made it known to all the neighbouring and other countries that the then Government of India in no way represented the Indian opinion and that the traditional policy of British Government had been guided by considerations more of holding India in subjection than of protecting her borders. The Congress stated in clear terms that India as a self-governing country could have nothing to fear from the neighbouring states or any state as her people had no designs on any of them and hence no intention of establishing any trade relations hostile to or not desired by the people of such states.

The Congress further pointed out that the people of India regarded most treaties entered into with the Imperial Government by neighbouring states as mainly designed to keep India in subjection. It urged upon the neighbouring states having no ill-will against the people of India and having no desire to injure her interests to refrain from entering into any such treaty with the Imperial Government.<sup>292</sup> Establishment of friendly relations with the neighbouring Asian Countries became one of the chief objectives of the Congress. Keeping in view this objective the Madras Congress of 1927 asked for the withdrawal of Indian troops from Mesopotamia and Persia and from all British colonies and foreign countries wherever they might be.<sup>293</sup> In 1928, the Congress declared that the Indian struggle was a part of the general world struggle against imperialism and hence desired that India should develop contacts with other countries which were also fighting against imperialism. The Congress also decided to open a Foreign Department in its office to develop such contacts.<sup>294</sup> This Congress assured the people of Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Iraq of its full sympathy with them in their struggle to free themselves from the Clutches of the Western imperialism which was also a great menace to the Indian struggle for freedom.<sup>295</sup>

India's zeal for promoting Asian solidarity received impetus from her participation in the several conferences in which she played commendable role. In 1926 a Pan-Asiatic Conference was held at Nagasaki. Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Korean and Japanese nationals were present in this Conference. There were much bombastic and ideal talks but little result came out of its high sounding proposals. The Conference however, was one of the strands in the wind of Asian solidarity.<sup>296</sup> India's active role in the Conference helped the growth of Asian consciousness in India.

India's urge for friendship with Asian countries, her desire to co-ordinate Indian freedom struggle with the similar movements in the neighbouring countries and her ambition to create a common understanding among the oppressed nations of Asia got much encouragement from the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities held at Brussels, Belgium, in February, 1927. The Brussels Congress gave the biggest boost to Asian solidarity and India's active role in the Congress gave a definite shape to India's Asian policy.

It was a conference or an assemblage of the representatives of the exploited and suppressed nations of the world along with the sympathisers from the imperial countries. One hundred seventy four mandated delegates, representing 31 countries

and a number of interested guests, not mandated, were present in the conference. Despite various difficulties delegates had come from Africa, Mexico, Indonesia, Indochina, Egypt, India, Korea, the Philippines, China, Persia, Algeria, Tunis, Morocco, Syria and Arabia. Besides these delegates the workers' organisations of England, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, the United States and Japan sent their spokesmen to the conference. China had sent 30 delegates, representing the Kuomintang, the Canton Army, the Canton Government, various students, and women's organisations. Jawahar Lal Nehru was the accredited representative of the Indian National Congress. Some of the leading nationalists of Asia attended the meeting. Mohammed Hatta, who later became the Vice-president of Indonesia and Ho-Chi Minh, who became the president of North Vietnam, took part in the deliberations of the Congress. The Congress was summoned with the active support and sympathy of Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein, Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Madam Sun Yat Sen and Mahatma Gandhi. In his message to the Congress, Gandhi thanked the organisers for the invitation accorded to him and regretted his inability to take part in the Congress and wished the conference a success.<sup>297</sup>

Jawahar Lal Nehru played an active role in the Brussels Congress and on one occasion he presided over the meeting of the Congress. In his speech at the Congress Nehru made a frontal attack on British imperialism for her policy of plunder, exploitation and repression in India and Asia and laid stress on the indissoluble link between the exploited and freedom fighting nations because there was much in common between them. He highlighted the need and the significance of the contact between the various enslaved peoples as it would lead to better understanding of each other's problems and the co-operation thus generated would bring freedom nearer home. He frankly admitted that on account of India other lands had suffered and were suffering still. Referring to the use of Indian troops for the suppression of nationalist movements in Asian countries he said that the list of such nations where Indian troops had been employed was horrifying one. Indian troops had been used in China, the Persian Gulf, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria, Tibet, Afghanistan and Burma.

He further declared that even at the time of the deliberations of the Conference Indian soldiers were being used against Chinese nationalists. Condemning the despatch of Indian troops to China and expressing India's solidarity with the Chinese people. Nehru observed that it had been a matter of shame and sorrow to Indians that the British Government should venture to send Indian troops to China to coerce the Chinese and to suppress their nationalist movement. He informed the Brussels Congress that the whole of nationalist India was with the Chinese brethren in their hour of trial. "India to-day is with China", remarked Nehru, "not only because she has every sympathy for her, but because she feels that China's successful fight is the most hopeful sign of the future downfall of imperialism."<sup>298</sup> Continuing Nehru pointed out that India was the key to the exploitation of all Asia and the emancipation of India was necessary for the emancipation of the mankind. It is important for you if we win freedom", Nehru told the nations of Asia present at the conference, "not only internal freedom but freedom also to make connections with our neighbours and other lands as we wish."<sup>299</sup> He urged the subject nations to co-operate together and to form a common front against

imperialism and expressed the hope that the Brussels Congress would help in bringing about this co-operation among the oppressed nations.<sup>300</sup>

The Brussels Congress lasted for six days and throughout the session imperialism was condemned and need for closer collaboration among the exploited nation was emphasised. It discussed issues related to far and wide but China and India were the main topics of discussion. Too much reference to India and China raised the protest that the Congress was proceeding as if "it was almost an Indo-Chinese one."<sup>301</sup> After six days of hard labour the Brussels Congress passed forty resolutions out of which four resolutions were of utmost interest to the Indians and the Asian countries. The Congress assured support to the Indian National Movement in the task of emancipation of India,<sup>302</sup> But the most important, from purely Asian point of view was the resolution issued jointly by the Indian and Chinese delegations. The joint declaration referred to the time long intimate and close cultural ties between India and China and stressed the need of the revival of that lively contact between the two neighbours who were facing forced isolation caused by the intrigue of the British imperialists. Condemning the use of Indian men and money against the Chinese people the joint declaration hoped that Indian leaders would co-ordinate their struggle with that of the Chinese people so that by simultaneously engaging British imperialism on two of its most vital fronts, China might get active support in her struggle.<sup>303</sup>

India's sympathy with Asian nations was not confined to China alone. Nehru expressed solidarity with Mesopotamia where Indian soldiers were stationed to suppress the people. Indian clerks and employees had also taken part in the exploitation of that country. It was thus in the fitness of things that Nehru demanded the recall of the army from Mesopotamia and declared that Indians would not be a party to this imperialist adventure and exploitation.<sup>304</sup>

Nehru viewed this Brussels Congress with much hope and he requested the Indian National Congress to affiliate itself with the League against Imperialism, the permanent body established by the Brussels Congress. Nehru pointed out that India would derive many benefits from its affiliation with the League against Imperialism and among the advantages were the opportunities to keep in touch with many Asiatic and other countries with problems not dissimilar to Indian problems. He further declared that since long the Congressmen had been demanding that India must establish contacts with foreign countries so that India might inform the foreign countries the real state of affairs in the country. As India's resources were limited he told the Congress to utilise the League against Imperialism as a means of foreign propaganda without spending much on this work. India could not remain indifferent to rapid changes taking place in the world and this League, Nehru hoped, would play an important role in future as a League of Nations of Peoples, a truer one than the League of Governments which sat at Geneva. On the request and personal initiative of Nehru the Indian National Congress was affiliated to the League against Imperialism.<sup>305</sup>

In his report to the Indian National Congress Nehru mentioned that there was a very strong desire amongst the representatives of Asia for a closer bond between Asiatic countries. Every Asiatic delegation affirmed the need of mutual co-operation. The Chinese delegates were very eager to develop close ties with India and to receive

Indians in China as accredited representatives of the Indian National Congress, or as students or as visitors and were ready to afford all facilities to Indian students desirous of reading in China.<sup>306</sup>

Though there was a strong desire amongst the Asiatics to develop mutual co-operation but nothing practicable could be suggested. Nehru, however, thought that the League against Imperialism would offer the Asiatics a common meeting ground and all the national organisations could remain in touch with each other through this League. Nehru also urged the Indian National Congress to invite fraternal delegates from other countries and to co-ordinate Indian struggle with the similar movements in other countries.<sup>307</sup>

The Brussels Congress influenced Nehru and through him the Indian National Congress. It was an event of first class importance<sup>308</sup> and helped Nehru to understand some of the problems of the colonial and dependent countries.<sup>309</sup> The Brussels Congress left an indelible mark on India's attitude towards her neighbours and the most significant and positive result of the conference was the re-establishment, after a long period of mutual isolation, of the direct and friendly contacts between India and China. The joint declaration of the Indian and Chinese delegations and the protests made against the despatch of Indian troops to China and Mesopotamia symbolised the deep and profound love and sympathy Indian people had for China and Mesopotamia. At the Brussels Congress the Sino-Indian Co-operation was recognised to be the key to Asiatic liberation. This realisation of which the joint Indo-Chinese declaration was the result, became of utmost significance for it was destined to become the pattern for all subsequent formulations of Indian policy towards her neighbours.<sup>310</sup>

After the First World War the idea of Asian solidarity became one of the ideals of the Indian politics. This idea of solidarity gave place to the talk of regional integration or Asiatic Federation. To translate into institutional form the concept of Asian solidarity Indian nationalist leaders began to talk of Asiatic Federation. "Behind this urge for Asian unity", Bimal Prasad significantly observed, "lay not only a feeling of strong cultural and political bond with Asian countries, but also the realisation that their coming together would improve their chances of security, equality with Europe and a voice in world affairs."<sup>311</sup> The Aga Khan wrote in 1918 that a Southern Asiatic Federation should be created of which India would be the pivot, embracing "a vast agglomeration of states, principalities, and countries of Asia, extending from Aden to Mesopotamia and from the two shores of the Gulf of India proper, from India proper across Burma, and including the Malay Peninsula and thence from Ceylon to the states of Bokhara and from Tibet to Singapore".<sup>312</sup> Thereafter, the idea of Asiatic Federation became a coveted theme for discussion among the Indian leaders who envisaged several schemes for Asiatic Federation.

Gandhi in the *Young India* dated April 14, 1920 appreciated the common spirit of the Asiatic struggle for freedom and lent his support in favour of the scheme for regional integration in Asia. Gandhi wrote: "Common lot no less than territorial homogeneity and cultural affinity is bringing the Asiatic races wonderfully together, and they now seem determined to take their fullest share in the world politics".<sup>313</sup> The scheme for Asiatic Federation got the approval of the Indian

National Congress in 1922 when C.R. Das, in his presidential address, urged India's participation in the great Asiatic Federation which he saw in the process of formation. "I have hardly any doubt", remarked C.R. Das, "that Pan-Islamic movement, which was started on a somewhat narrow basis, has given way or is about to give way to the great Federation of all Asiatic people. It is the union of the oppressed nationalities of India".<sup>314</sup> He further observed: "Our freedom must be won by ourselves but such a bond of friendship and love of sympathy and co-operation, between India and the rest of Asia, nay between India and all the liberty loving people of the world, is destined to bring about world peace".<sup>315</sup>

The idea of Asian federation was never again permitted to die and discussion took periodically at all the important meetings. In his presidential speech for the All India Khilafat Conference held at Gaya in 1922, Dr. M.A. Ansari stressed the need of a Pan-Asiatic movement to bring about the solidarity among the people and countries of Asia with a view to rescuing them from the political and economic bondage of Europe. He suggested that missions should be sent on behalf of India to establish friendly relations with peoples of different Asiatic countries and missions elected by the people of foreign lands should be invited to India for the same purpose. Dr. Ansari further suggested that the plenary session of the Asiatic Federation might be held at a suitable place, preferably in India at the time of the annual session of the Indian National Congress. Pointing out the advantages that would accrue to India from Asiatic Federation he appealed to the Indian people to give a lead in the matter.<sup>316</sup>

Other political associations in India also wanted some sort of regional integration in Asia. In his presidential address to the All India Muslim League held in March, 1923, Bhurgri discussed the practicability of the scheme for Asiatic Federation and optimistically pointed out that signs were not wanting of such a federation of states—a real League of Nations coming into being. Continuing he observed: "Some people think the idea of a League of Oriental Nations to be a dream, but when I notice the aggression of Europe against Asia and Africa, the behaviour of the white races towards the coloured peoples and colour prejudice in some of the Western countries, I clearly see the early realisation of this dream".<sup>317</sup> In a resolution the All India Muslim League declared that the people of India would participate in the formation of Federation of Eastern countries with the object of mutual help in the matter of trade and commerce and to free themselves from the economic exploitation by Europe and with a view to enlarge and support the Oriental Culture and to maintain good and friendly relations between the various nationalities all over the East.<sup>318</sup>

At the annual meeting of the Congress held at Coconada in 1923, Mohammed Ali commended the idea of Asiatic or Eastern Federation and expressed his pleasure at the attempts made by Hindu leaders for establishing closer relationship with other Eastern countries. Appreciating the Asian outlook of the Hindu leaders Mohammed Ali stated that their political ideas had scaled the ramparts of the Himalayas and the most of the surrounding seas as they recognised that the freedom of every Asiatic Nations would help their own freedom and therefore they contemplated an Eastern Federation. He further pointed out that the first step in the establishment of the Asiatic Federation was taken by Gandhi at Amritsar in

1919, when he identified himself with the cause of the Khilafat. Mohammed Ali asked his co-religionists in India to forget the internal differences with the Hindus and to support the latter in the task of the formation of an Asiatic or an Eastern Federation.<sup>319</sup>

Asiatic Federation became the theme of all political deliberations in India. In her presidential speech for the Indian National Congress held in 1925 Mrs. Sarojini Naidu endorsed C.R. Das's plan for the creation of the Asiatic Federation.<sup>320</sup> S. Srinivas Iyengar, the Congress president in 1926, discussed the possibility of such an organisation and pointed out that the time "has perhaps come for us seriously to think of a Federation of the Asiatic peoples for their common welfare. So long as our neighbours were ruled by irresponsible autocrats, such an idea was clearly out of question. Now that Angora, Persia, China and Siberia are governed by democracies, a federation of Asiatic democracies will make for peace, prosperity and freedom of Asia and therefore comes within the range of practical politics."<sup>321</sup> The Congress President further suggested that in order to promote better understanding between India and other Asiatic countries frequent intercourse or visits by appropriate delegations should be arranged. He told the Indian people that for long Indians had neglected the possibilities of a cultural and business union with all Asiatic countries and urged them to explore all means and ways to effect a good understanding between India and other fellow Asiatic countries.<sup>322</sup> A Govinda Charyulu, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Andhra Provincial Conference held in November, 1926, called upon all the Asiatics to organise themselves into a Confederation for self protection. It was the duty of the Congress, he said, to take initiative and all possible steps for the immediate formation of the Asiatic Federation. Criticising the composition of the League of Nations and the stronghold of the Europeans over it, he stated that the League of Nations could not protect the coloured subject races of Asia against the tyranny of their white master. He advised the Asiatic people to wake up and disown their belief upon the mission of the League of Nations and organise into a federation.<sup>323</sup>

The scheme for a federation of Asiatic nations was looked upon with favour by Dr. M.A. Ansari, the President of the Indian National Congress in 1927. Making an appeal for the formation of an Asiatic Federation, the only hope that could check the mounting imperialist forces, he regarded India as the key-stone of the arch of British imperialism in Asia and declared that India held in her hands the remedy for this universal misfortune. He thought that once India was free the whole edifice of imperialism would collapse like a pack of cards. To Dr. Ansari, the best guarantee for the freedom of Asia was a free and self governing India.<sup>324</sup> Dr. Ansari declared that the only hope of success in checking the forces of European imperialism consisted in Eastern nations coming closer and taking a more intimate interest in the problems facing them. Explaining the special role India had to play in such a scheme for Asiatic Federation, Dr. Ansari observed that fortunately Indians were so placed that a part of their population (Muslim population) had cultural affinity with countries in the west of Asia while another part (Hindu population) had similar relationship with the countries lying in the east of the continent. Their economic problems were also more or less similar. "Common culture and common interest should, therefore", Dr. Ansari remarked, "facilitate the consummation of the

scheme of an Asiatic Federation".<sup>325</sup>

The idea of an Asiatic Federation had become so popular with the Indian leaders that in 1928 the Congress adopted a motion directing its Working Committee to correspond with the leaders of other Asian countries and take necessary steps to hold the first session of a Pan-Asiatic Federation in India in 1930.<sup>326</sup>

Closely associated with Indian attempts for Asian solidarity and an Asiatic Federation was India's claim for special status in Asia. While advocating the scheme of Southern Asiatic Federation the Aga Khan stressed the pivotal position of India in such a scheme.<sup>327</sup> Since then the concept of India as the pivot in the continent became a fashion for the Indian leaders. Keeping in view the economic, political strategic and geographical status of India, Tilak wrote to Clemenceau, the President of the Versailles Peace Conference, that a free India could be a powerful Steward of the League of Nations in the East for maintaining the peace of the world and a leading power in Asia, if not in the world.<sup>328</sup>

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>K M. Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance*, p. 259.
- <sup>2</sup>Jan. Romein, *op. cit*; p. 39.
- <sup>3</sup>K.M. Panikkar, *op. cit*; p. 195.
- <sup>4</sup>Upton Close, *The Revolt of Asia* (1927) p. 118.
- <sup>5</sup>Stanley Rice, *The Challenge of Asia* (1925) p. 27.
- <sup>6</sup>D. Graham Pole, *India in Transition* (1932) p. 22.
- <sup>7</sup>K.K. Datta, *Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi Relating to Bihar 1917-1947* (1960) p. 327.
- <sup>8</sup>M.R. Jayakar, *Story of My Life*, Vol. I, p. 272.
- <sup>9</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *op. cit*; p. 47.
- <sup>10</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Autobiography*, pp. 46-47.
- <sup>11</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *The History of the Indian National Congress*, Vol. I, pp. 202-4.
- <sup>12</sup>Khaliquzzaman, *op. cit*; p. 57.
- <sup>13</sup>K.K. Datta, *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, p. 53.
- <sup>14</sup>Kanji Dwaradas, *India's Fight For Freedom* (1966), p. 149.
- <sup>15</sup>M.H. Saiyid, *Mohammed Ali Jinnah, A Political Study*, p. 186.
- <sup>16</sup>V.B. Kulkarni, *British Statesmen in India* (1961) p. 290.
- <sup>17</sup>D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, Vol. II. p. 236.
- <sup>18</sup>B.R. Nanda, *The Nehru s Motilal and Jawaharlal* (1962) p. 205.
- <sup>19</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1923, Vol. II; p. 143.
- <sup>20</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1924, Vol. I, p. 70.
- <sup>21</sup>K.K. Datta, *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, p. 60.
- <sup>22</sup>*Report of the thirty-ninth Indian National Congress*, 1924, pp. 38-41.
- <sup>23</sup>*Ibid*, pp. 25-26.
- <sup>24</sup>*The Times of India*, December 30, 1926.
- <sup>25</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, pp. 122-23.
- <sup>26</sup>A Statement Signed by the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Kerala Provincial Congress Committee, Secretary, Calicut District Congress Committee and Secretary, Ernad Khilafat Committee and K.V. Gopal Menon Cited in Sankaran Nair, *Gandhi and Anarchy*, (1922) Appendix-III.
- <sup>27</sup>Afzal Iqbal, (ed). *Select Writings & Speeches of Mohammed Ali Asaraf* (1944) p. 307.
- <sup>28</sup>Shaukat Ali to Gandhi, March 4, 1927, cited in B.R. Nanda, *op. cit*. p. 271.
- <sup>29</sup>K.M. Munshi, *Indian Constitutional Documents*, Vol. I. (1967) p. 24.
- <sup>30</sup>K.K. Datta *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, p. 62.
- <sup>31</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. II, p. 380.
- <sup>32</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. II, p. 443.
- <sup>33</sup>*All Parties Conference 1928, Report of the Committee appointed by the Conference to determine the principles of the Constitution for India*, (Allahabad: General Secretary, All India Congress Committee, 1928) p. 23
- <sup>34</sup>K.M. Munshi, *op. cit*; p. 24.
- <sup>35</sup>J. Coatman, *Years of Destiny: India 1926-32* (1932) p. 214.
- <sup>36</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1928 Vol. II, p. 403.
- <sup>37</sup>Kanji Dwarkadas, *op. cit*; p. 341.
- <sup>38</sup>M.H. Saiyid, *Mohammed Ali Jinnah*; p. 272.
- <sup>39</sup>M.A. Mehtar, *Whys of the Great Indian Conflict* (1947) pp. 67-73.
- <sup>40</sup>S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India & the Birth of Pakistan* (1965) p. 95.
- <sup>41</sup>*The Times of India*, January 2, 1929.
- <sup>42</sup>Maurice Gwyer and A. Appadorai, *Speeches and Documents on the Indian Constitution 1921-47* (1957) Vol. I, pp. 245-47.
- <sup>43</sup>M.H. Saiyid, *op. cit*; pp. 450-59.
- <sup>44</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1928, Vol. II, p. 34.
- <sup>45</sup>R. Dwivedi *The Life and Speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru* (1929) p. 95.
- <sup>46</sup>*Young India*, July 26, 1928.

- <sup>47</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.* Vol. I, p. 330.
- <sup>48</sup>K.K. Datta, *op. cit.*; p. 64.
- <sup>49</sup>*The Times*, November 1, 1929.
- <sup>50</sup>Lord Halifax, *Fulness of Days* (1957) p. 120.
- <sup>51</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1929, Vol. II, p. 300.
- <sup>52</sup>*The Times*, London, January 7, 1918.
- <sup>53</sup>*The Indian Review*, January 1919, p. 13.
- <sup>54</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1920, Vol. I, pp. 243-44.
- <sup>55</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 281-82.
- <sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 273-74.
- <sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 249.
- <sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 250-51.
- <sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 23.
- <sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 24.
- <sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 251.
- <sup>62</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *op. cit.*; p. 47.
- <sup>63</sup>Gandhi, *An Autobiography*, (1949) pp. 401-2.
- <sup>64</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1902, p. 252.
- <sup>65</sup>*Congress Presidential Addresses, Second Series*, 1911-34. pp. 469-70.
- <sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>67</sup>N.V. Raj Kumar, *The Background of Indian Foreign Policy*, p. 41.
- <sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 411.
- <sup>69</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1920, p. 458.
- <sup>70</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 460-62.
- <sup>71</sup>V.P.S. Raghuvanshi, *Op. cit.*; p. 155.
- <sup>72</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed) *The History and Culture of the Indian People Struggle for Freedom*, p. 317.
- <sup>73</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*; Vol. I, p. 190.
- <sup>74</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, p. 37.
- <sup>75</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*; Vol. I, p. 190.
- <sup>76</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, p. 38.
- <sup>77</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>78</sup>Tendulkar, *op. cit.*; Vol. I, p. 284.
- <sup>79</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, p. 39.
- <sup>80</sup>Khalid B. Saiyeed, *op. cit.*; p. 45.
- <sup>81</sup>*Indian Annual Register*, 1921, p. 39.
- <sup>82</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*; p. 191.
- <sup>83</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed) *The History and Culture by the Indian People: Struggle For Freedom*, p. 329.
- <sup>84</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*; p. 196.
- <sup>85</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, p. 43.
- <sup>86</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed) *The History and Culture by the Indian people: Struggle for Freedom*, p. 320.
- <sup>87</sup>Sibnarayan Ray (ed) *Gandhi, India and the World, An International Symposium*, p. 167.
- <sup>88</sup>*The Times of India*, June 25, 1920.
- <sup>89</sup>S. Mukherjee, *Communalism in Muslim Politics and Troubles over India* (1947) p. 35.
- <sup>90</sup>B.R. Ambedkar, *Pakistan or the Partition of India*, pp. 138-40.
- <sup>91</sup>Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*; p. 236.
- <sup>92</sup>Ram Gopal, *Indian Muslims, op, cit.*; p. 144-46.
- <sup>93</sup>Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, p. 121.
- <sup>94</sup>S. Mukherjee, *op, cit.*, p. 35.
- <sup>95</sup>Arnold Fletcher, *Afghanistan: Highway of Conquest* (1966) p. 298.
- <sup>96</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, p. 47.
- <sup>97</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed) *The History and Culture of the Indian People; Struggle for Freedom*, p. 332.

- <sup>98</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, Part I, p. 49.
- <sup>99</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1920-23. Being a Collection of the Resolutions of the Congress and of the All India Congress Committee and of the Working Committee of the Congress from September, 1920 to December, 1923.* (Allahabad: The A.I.C.C., 1924) pp. 6-9.
- <sup>100</sup>*Englishman*, September 8, 1920
- <sup>101</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, Part II, p. 131.
- <sup>102</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 134.
- <sup>103</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 214.
- <sup>104</sup>Patabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*, Vol. I. p. 206.
- <sup>105</sup>*The Times of India*, January, 3 1921.
- <sup>106</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>107</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1921, Vol. II, pp. 238-39.
- <sup>108</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1920-23*, pp. 101-2.
- <sup>109</sup>S.K. Majumdar, *Jinnah and Gandhi* (1966) p. 63.
- <sup>110</sup>*The Indian Annual Register 1922*, Vol. I, pp. 238-39.
- <sup>111</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>112</sup>S.K. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
- <sup>113</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1922, Vol. I, p. 270.
- <sup>114</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 308.
- <sup>115</sup>*Congress Presidential Addresses, Second Series, 1911-34*, pp. 532-33.
- <sup>116</sup>Patabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*, p. 225.
- <sup>117</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1920-33*, p. 155.
- <sup>118</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1922, Vol. I, Appendix, p. 71-76.
- <sup>119</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 117.
- <sup>120</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 128.
- <sup>121</sup>Patabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
- <sup>122</sup>*Report of the Thirty Seven Indian National Congress*, 1922, p. 1.
- <sup>123</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1923, Vol. I, p. 918.
- <sup>124</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 924-26.
- <sup>125</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 193.
- <sup>126</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1920-23*, p. 305.
- <sup>127</sup>*Young India*, September 8, 1921.
- <sup>128</sup>*Ibid.*, April 27, 1921.
- <sup>129</sup>*Report of the Thirtv Seventh Indian National Congress*, p. 1.
- <sup>130</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1920-23*, p. 305.
- <sup>131</sup>Polak and others, *Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 160.
- <sup>132</sup>J.L. Nehru *Autobiography* (1936) p. 72.
- <sup>133</sup>M.H. Saiyid, *Mohammed Ali, Jinnah, op. cit.*, p. 72.
- <sup>134</sup>M.R. Jayakar, *Story of My Life*, p. 388.
- <sup>135</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People: Struggle for Freedom*, pp. 318-19.
- <sup>136</sup>M.H. Saiyid, *Mohammad Ali Jinnah*, pp. 252-53.
- <sup>137</sup>A.B. Rajput, *Muslim Lcague Yesterday and Today*, (1948) p. 37.
- <sup>138</sup>Zia-ud-Din Ahmed Suleri, *My Leader* (1946) p. 52.
- <sup>139</sup>Anand T. Hingorani (ed) *The Hindu-Muslim Unity* (1965) p. 9.
- <sup>140</sup>M.K. Gandhi, *Communal Unity* (1949) p. 26.
- <sup>141</sup>*Young India*, May 11, 1921.
- <sup>142</sup>D.N. Verma, "India and Asian Solidarity 1900-1939", Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Vol. XLIX, January-December, 1963, p. 320.
- <sup>143</sup>*The Times of India*, January 3, 1921.
- <sup>144</sup>Cited in V.P.S. Raghuvanshi, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-55.
- <sup>145</sup>Kalidas Nag, *Discovery of Asia*.
- <sup>146</sup>G.S. Pohekar, "Tagore and Asis," *United Asia*, 1948, Vol. I, pp. 50-51.
- <sup>147</sup>Rabindranath Tagore, *Nationalism*, p. 92.

- <sup>148</sup>Kalidas Nag, "Tagore in Asia," *Rabindranath Tagore: A Centenary Volume 1861-1961* (1961) p. 340.
- <sup>149</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 341.
- <sup>150</sup>Sisir Gupta, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- <sup>151</sup>G.S. Pohekar, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
- <sup>152</sup>Kalidas Nag, "Tagore in Asia," *op. cit.*, p. 342.
- <sup>153</sup>*Visvabharati Quarterly*, July 1924, p. 199.
- <sup>154</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>155</sup>Man Mohan Ghosh, *China's Conflict with India and the Soviet Union* (1969) p. 52.
- <sup>156</sup>P.C. Chakravarti "Sino-Indian Relations," in A. Appadorai (ed) *India-Studies in Social and Political Development 1947-67*, pp. 258-59.
- <sup>157</sup>This address has been printed as an *Introduction to Tagore's Talks in China*, (1924).
- <sup>158</sup>Kalidas Nag, "Tagore in Asia," *op. cit.*, p. 343.
- <sup>159</sup>G.S. Pohekar, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
- <sup>160</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>161</sup>P.C. Chakravarti, "Sino-Indian Relations," *op. cit.*, p. 259.
- <sup>162</sup>Nguyen Dang Thuck, "Tagore in Vietnam," *Rabindranath Tagore: A Centenary Volume 1861-1961* (1962) p. 360.
- <sup>163</sup>P. C. Chakravarti, "Sino-Indian Relations," *op. cit.*, p. 259.
- <sup>164</sup>Manmohan Ghosh, *China's Conflict with India and the Soviet Union*, p. 55.
- <sup>165</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>166</sup>Nguyen Dang Thuck, *op. cit.*, p. 360.
- <sup>167</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, pp. 123-24.
- <sup>168</sup>*Cited in India View of China Before the Communist Revolution* Hindi-Cheeni in Collaboration with Dr. Amba Rai, Centres for Int. Studies, Massachusetts, Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 18, 1955. Its Communication Program, India Project, E/55-15 (Sapru House Library) p. 2.
- <sup>169</sup>*Vide Visvabharati News*, June, 1947.
- <sup>170</sup>Krishna Kripalani, *Tagore: A Life* (Malancha, New Delhi 1961) p. 171.
- <sup>171</sup>Sonakul Dhani, "Tagore in Siam," *Rabindranath Tagore : A Centenary Volume 1861-1961*, p. 308.
- <sup>172</sup>Nguyen Dang Thuck, *op. cit.*, p. 362.
- <sup>173</sup>Krishna Kripalani, *op. cit.*, p. 176.
- <sup>174</sup>G.S. Pohekar, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
- <sup>175</sup>*Visvabharati News*, 1924, p. 111.
- <sup>176</sup>Manmohan Ghosh, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
- <sup>177</sup>G.S. Pohekar, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- <sup>178</sup>*Visvabharati News*, 1924, p. 111.
- <sup>179</sup>G.S. Pohekar, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- <sup>180</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>181</sup>Kalidas Nag, "Tagore in Asia," *op. cit.*; p. 340.
- <sup>182</sup>*Cited in Krishna Kripalani, op. cit.*, p. 163.
- <sup>183</sup>*Young India*, January 26, 1922.
- <sup>184</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>185</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 260.
- <sup>186</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1924*, (Allahabad, The All India Congress Committee, 1925) p. 34.
- <sup>187</sup>*Young India*, March 10, 1927.
- <sup>188</sup>U.R. Rao, "Gandhiji and Asia," *United Asia*, 1948, Vol. I, p. 60.
- <sup>189</sup>J.S. Furnivall, *Colonial Policy and Practice* (New York, 1948) pp. 142-49.
- <sup>190</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>191</sup>Nicholas Tarling, *A Concise History of South East Asia*, (New York, 1966) pp. 213-214.
- <sup>192</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December, 24, 1927.
- <sup>193</sup>*The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. II, p. 380.

- 194 *Ibid.*
- 195 Mahadev Haribhai Desai, *With Gandhiji in Ceylon; A Journal of the Tour with Authorised Version of all Important Speeches* (Madras, Ganesan, 1928) p. 44 and pp. 118-19.
- 196 *Young India*, December 1, 1927.
- 197 *Young India*, March 10, 1927.
- 198 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1929, Vol. II, p. 12.
- 199 Y.N. Khanal, *Background of Nepal's Foreign Policy*, p. 2.
- 200 G.P. Bhattacharjee, *India and Politics of Modern Nepal* (1970) pp. 20-21.
- 201 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1924, Vol. II, p. 486.
- 202 *Ibid.*, 1942, pp. 122-23.
- 203 *The Indian National Congress*, 1920-23, p. 300.
- 204 *The Bengalee*, December 19, 1926.
- 205 Irving S. Friedman, "Indian Nationalism and the Far East," *op. cit.*, p. 22.
- 206 *India & South East Asia*, 1953, p. 32.
- 207 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1928, Vol. II, p. 372.
- 208 D.N. Mallik, *The Development of Non-Alignment in Indian's Foreign Policy* (1967) pp. 9-10.
- 209 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1928, Vol. II, pp. 285-86.
- 210 Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
- 211 W. Smith, *Modern Islam in India : A Social Analysis*, pp. 235-36.
- 212 S. Abid Husain, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
- 213 Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, p. 238.
- 214 Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
- 215 George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs* (1969) p. 240.
- 216 Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, p. 235.
- 217 Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
- 218 Taraknath Das, *India in World Politics* (1923) p. 76.
- 219 R. C. Majumdar (ed) *The History and the culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, p. 812.
- 220 Rushbrook Williams, *India in 1921-3*, p. 63.
- 221 *Young India*, May 4, 1921.
- 222 *Ibid.*
- 223 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1922, Vol. I, p. 128.
- 224 *Ibid.*, 1923, Vol. I. p. 944.
- 225 Taraknath Das, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
- 226 M. Ishaque, *Modern Persian Poetry* (1943) p. 145.
- 227 Jan Romein, *op. cit.*, p. 202.
- 228 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 31, 1928.
- 229 *Ibid.*, December 8, 1927.
- 230 Arnold Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
- 231 *Indian National Herald*, December 6, 1928.
- 232 N. B. Parulekar, "The Future of Islam in India", *Asia*, Vol. XXVIII, November, 1928, p. 940.
- 233 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. II, p. 330.
- 234 *Ibid.*, p. 334.
- 235 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 31, 1928.
- 236 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1928, Vol. II, p. 56.
- 237 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 29, 1928.
- 238 Sir Percy M. Sykes, *History of Afghanistan*, Vol. II, (1940) p. 311.
- 239 Vartan Gregorian, *op. cit.*, pp. 264-65.
- 240 *Congress Bulletin*, 1929-1931 (Allahabad: The All India Congress Committee) January 27, 1929.
- 241 *Ibid.*, February 14, 1929.
- 242 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1929, Vol. I, p. 382.
- 243 *Ibid.*, p. 381.

- 244 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 3, 1929.
- 245 Ghani Khan, *The Pathans*, (1947) p. 48.
- 246 Arnold Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
- 247 *The Modern Review*, Vol. XLV, February 1929, p. 283.
- 248 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 16, 1929.
- 249 *Ibid.*, October 29, 1929.
- 250 *The Modern Review*, Vol. XLV, February 1929, p. 283.
- 251 N.N. Ghosh, "The Afghan Civil War 1928-29". *The Modern Review*, February, 1930, pp. 180-81.
- 252 P.C. Chakravarti, *India-China Relations*, (1961) p. 3.
- 253 R.P. Dutte, *India a To-day*, p. 447.
- 254 Irvin S. Friedman, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
- 255 *Ibid.*
- 256 *Young India*, July 30, 1925.
- 257 *The Indian National Congress*, 1925 (Allahabad, the All India Congress Committee, 1926) p. 4.
- 258 *The Times*, London, January 27, 1927.
- 259 *The Bengalee*, January 28, 1927.
- 260 *Forward*, January 29, 1927.
- 261 Chapala Kant Bhattacharya, "Rabindranath on China, why India is a Menace to Asiatic Freedom", *Forward*, February 4, 1927.
- 262 *The Times*, London, February 1, 1927.
- 263 *The Bengalee*, February 4, 1927.
- 264 *Young India*, February 3, 1927.
- 265 *Ibid.*
- 266 *The Servant of India*, 1927, pp. 645-46.
- 267 *Forward*, February 5, 1927.
- 268 *The Bengalee*, February 5, 1927.
- 269 *Ibid.*, February 9, 1927.
- 270 *Ibid.*, February 17, 1927.
- 271 *Ibid.*, February 27, 1927.
- 272 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. II, pp. 440-41.
- 273 *Forward*, March 24, 1927.
- 274 *Ibid.*, April 10, 1927.
- 275 *Ibid.*, April 13, 1927.
- 276 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 19, 1927.
- 277 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. I, p. 408.
- 278 *Ibid.*, p. 421.
- 279 *Ibid.*, p. 53.
- 280 *The Indian National Congress*, 1927, (Madras, The All India Congress Committee, n.d. 1928) p. 4.
- 281 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
- 282 *Forward*, June 10, 1927.
- 283 *Ibid.*, June 21, 1927.
- 284 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, Vol. II, p. 341.
- 285 *Report of the Forty-Second Indian National Congress*, 1927, (Madras: The Reception Committee, n.d.) p. 3.
- 286 Dorothy Norman (ed) *Nehru, the First Sixty Years*, p. 633.
- 287 *Ibid.*
- 288 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1928, Vol. II, pp. 285-86.
- 289 *Report of the Forty-Third Indian National Congress*, 1928, (Calcutta, The Reception Committee, n.d.), p. 94.
- 290 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 21, 1928.
- 291 *Ibid.*

- 292 *The Indian National Congress, 1920-23*, p. 75.
- 293 *Report of the Forty-Second Indian National Congress, 1927*, p. 94.
- 294 *Report of the Forty-Third Indian National Congress, 1928*, p. 91.
- 295 *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- 296 *Japan Weekly Chronicle*, August 12, 1926.
- 297 Bakar Ali Mirza, "The Congress Against Imperialism", *The Modern Review*, Vol. XLI, January-June 1927, p. 556.
- 298 *The Indian Quarterly Register, 1927*, Vol. I, p. 205.
- 299 G.H. Jansen, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- 300 *The Indian Quarterly Register, 1927*, Vol. I, p. 205.
- 301 Jawaharlal Nehru, Report on the International Congress against Imperialism held at Brussels", *The Indian National Congress, 1927*, (Madras The A.I.C.C., 1928) p. 69.
- 302 *Ibid.*, p. 69.
- 303 *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
- 304 *Ibid.*, p. 74.
- 305 *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.
- 306 *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78.
- 307 *Ibid.*, p. 77.
- 308 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- 309 J.L. Nehru, *Autobiography* (1938), p. 163.
- 310 Iqbal Singh, *India's Foreign Policy* (1946), p. 13.
- 311 B. Prasad, *The Origins of Indian Foreign Policy*, p. 78.
- 312 Cited in John Pollen, "The Home Rule Problem, H.H. The Aga Khan's vision of a Greater India, " *Asiatic Review*, XIV 1918, pp 430-35.
- 313 *Young India*, April 14, 1920.
- 314 *Congress Presidential Addresses. 2nd Series, 1911-34*, p. 579.
- 315 *Ibid.*, p. 580.
- 316 *The Indian Annual Register, 1923*, Vol. I, p. 921.
- 317 *Ibid.*, pp. 932-36.
- 318 *Ibid.*, p. 936.
- 319 *Report of the Thirty-Eight Indian National Congress, 1923* (Coconada: The Reception Committee, 1924), p. 78.
- 320 *Congress Presidential Addresses : From Silver to Golden Jubilee, 1911-1934*, pp. 762-63.
- 321 Sriman S. Srinivas Iyengar, *His Presidential Addresses of the 41st Indian National Congress and other speeches*, pp. 37-38.
- 322 *Ibid*
- 323 *The Indian Quarterly Register, 1926*, Vol. II, pp. 389-90.
- 324 *Congress Presidential Addresses : From Silver to Golden Jubilee, 1911-34*, p. 825.
- 325 *Ibid.*, p. 846.
- 326 *Report of the Forty-third Indian National Congress, 1928*, p. 92.
- 327 Quoted in John Pollen, *op. cit.*, pp. 430-35.
- 328 Cited in Kiran Mishra, "International Outlook of Indian Nationalism," *Afro-Asian and World Affairs* No. 2, 1964, p. 145.

## *CHAPTER V*

# **CONSOLIDATION OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT AND ATTEMPTS FOR ASIAN SOLIDARITY (1930-1945)**

The Lahore Congress in 1929 marked the beginning of a new era in the history of Nationalist India. The Congress declaration for complete independence invigorated the national life in India<sup>1</sup> and the whole nation observed with hope and joy January 26, 1930 as a day of deliverance and independence. Millions of Indian people took the pledge that it was a crime against man and God to submit any longer to a rule which had caused disaster in India and therefore India must sever the British connection and attain Purna Swaraj or Complete Independence.<sup>2</sup>

While the whole nation was hopeful and was prepared to sacrifice everything for the attainment of complete independence, the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, shattered the belief of the Indian people in the British Government by his statement issued on January 25, 1930. Lord Irwin declared that the Round Table Conference was meant only to elucidate the definition of Dominion Status and not to offer a solution of the problems that stood on the way to its attainment.<sup>3</sup> This statement enraged the Indian people and convinced them that self-determination was out of the question. Gandhi did not miss the opportunity. Convinced of the mass support and enthusiasm Gandhi wrote to the Viceroy expressing his reasons for opposing the British Government in India. Characterising the British rule as "a curse"<sup>4</sup> Gandhi presented his eleven demands to the Viceroy on March 2, 1930. He also informed the Viceroy that if these demands would be conceded, he would put off the struggle.<sup>5</sup> On the refusal of Lord Irwin to concede these demands, Gandhi, authorised by the Congress, launched the civil disobedience movement on March 11, 1930 by setting out on his famous Dandi March. On April 6, 1930 he broke the salt law by making salt from sea water. Nationwide Civil Disobedience started and the Government ordered the arrest of all law breakers.<sup>6</sup> Gandhi's arrest on May 4, 1930 intensified the movement which resulted in ninety thousand arrests by January 1931.<sup>7</sup>

But the situation improved when Gandhi-Irwin Pact was concluded on March 5, 1931. As a result of this agreement all the arrested leaders were released and the Congress agreed to discontinue civil disobedience and to participate in the Round Table Conference.<sup>8</sup> This pact could not solve Indian constitutional problems and to some Congress leaders it was a retreat for the Congress and for Nehru the

world ended "not with a bang, but a whimper."<sup>9</sup> No real understanding could develop between the Congress and the Government. Gandhiji, who attended the Round Table Conference as the sole representative of the Congress, returned empty handed on December 28, 1931.<sup>10</sup>

The Congress Working Committee at its meeting on January 1, 1932 regretted the failure of the Round Table Conference and decided to start civil disobedience which was to include boycott of foreign goods, picketing of liquor shops, foreign-cloth shops and unlicensed manufacture and collection of salt and civil breach of non-moral laws etc.<sup>11</sup> The British Government took repressive measures to crush Civil Disobedience Movement and all Congress leaders were arrested, public gatherings and processions were forbidden and newspapers were fully controlled.<sup>12</sup> Gandhi and Vallabhbhai Patel, the Congress president, were arrested on January 4, 1932. Gandhi was released from Jail in May, 1932 but the Civil Disobedience Movement could not make a headway on account of Gandhi's involvement in the task of modifying the Communal Award given by the British Prime Minister, Ramsay Mac Donald. This award provided separate electorates for the Depressed classes.<sup>13</sup> Gandhi was shocked and began a fast unto death in September, 1932 to protest against the Communal Award. The Poona Pact almost doubled the number of seats reserved for the Depressed Classes.<sup>14</sup>

The Congress temporarily suspended civil disobedience in May, 1933 to facilitate negotiations with the Government. But the Government's hesitant mood forced the Congress to resume civil disobedience in July, 1933 in a symbolic form. Under Gandhi's advice the Congress decided in July, 1933 to suspend mass civil disobedience but permitted individual civil disobedience. Gandhi was arrested on August 1, 1933 but was released on August 23, 1933. From all over the country, Congress workers followed the lead given by Gandhi and from August, 1933 to March, 1934 a regular stream of civil resisters maintained the campaign.<sup>15</sup> The Congress suspended the civil disobedience in May, 1934 and agreed to enter Legislature and formed a Parliamentary Board to run and control elections of members to the Legislatures on behalf of the Congress.<sup>16</sup>

It was in this atmosphere that the Government of India Act, 1935 was born. The Act provided for a Federation of India consisting of the British Indian provinces and the Indian States. The Act introduced a greater measure of autonomy in the provincial administration and provided for entrusting all the departments of provincial administration to the care of ministers responsible to legislatures but subject to the supervision of the Governor.<sup>17</sup>

The Government of India Act, 1935 did not satisfy the younger section of the Congress. Nehru called it "*a charter of slavery*" which deserved to be rejected "in its entirety."<sup>18</sup> But Gandhi and Patel were willing to explore the possibility of working the constitution of 1935 and they prevailed upon Nehru. The Congress decided to contest the elections.<sup>19</sup> The Congress obtained sweeping victory at the polls in 1937 and it secured majority in six of the eleven provinces of British India. In the legislatures of Bengal, Assam and North West Frontier Province the Congress became the largest single party.<sup>20</sup> The Congress formed ministries in six provinces where it had the majority and remained in office till the end of 1939.

Growth of communal feelings complicated the affairs in India. Jinnah, who had settled in England, returned to India and revived the Muslim League. The ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity was now determined to stage a showdown with the Congress. It seemed that while the Congress stood for the nation against the British, Jinnah stood for the Muslims against the Hindus domination. However, Muslim estrangement was not so formidable and sharp in 1935 as it was to be in the years that followed. No Muslim politician then contemplated the possibility of the partition of India.<sup>21</sup> During the election Jinnah and his Muslim League did not manifest an uncompromising anti-Congress or anti-national outlook. He was quite willing to co operate with Congress on a nation programme. In one of his election speeches in 1937 Jinnah declared : "there is no difference between the ideals of the Muslem League and of the Congress, the idea being complete freedom for India. There could not be any self-respecting Indian who favoured foreign domination or did not desire complete freedom and self-government for his country."<sup>22</sup>

Jinnah wanted to work out the constitution of 1935 with the Congress provided the latter did not challenge the position of the Muslim League as the only representative organisation of the Muslims.<sup>23</sup> At the polls the Muslim League could not fare well. Out of 489 Muslim seats the Muslim League captured only 104 seats. Out of 119 Muslim seats in Bengal the Muslim League won only 37 and in Punjab, it won only one seat out of 48 Muslim seats. Out of 36 and 37 Muslim seats in the North West Frontier Province and Sindh, the League did not win a single seat.<sup>24</sup> The results of the election gave a rude shock to Jinnah who began to do everything possible to revive the dormant Muslim League and the compromising attitude between the Muslim League and the Congress of the election period began to fade and cracks developed between the two political organisations. In the United Provinces there arose a controversy over the demand of the Muslim League for two seats in the ministry which the Congress refused to grant. The Congress refusal to give two seats to the Muslim League in the Ministry, according to Maulana Azad, was partly responsible for the creation of Pakistan.<sup>25</sup> The Muslim League became furious and began to condemn to Congress rule as the Hindu Raj.<sup>26</sup> To counter the popularity of the Congress and to make the Muslim League popular among the Muslims Jinnah moved heaven and earth and after the Lucknow Session of the Muslim League in October, 1937, ninety branches of the League were established in U.P. and 40 in Punjab.<sup>27</sup> On the questions of the national anthem *Bande Matram*, Urdu-Hindi and on several other petty issues the Hindus and Muslims drifted from one another and the Congress and Muslim League moved into two different directions.

While the Congress and the Muslim League were moving into two opposite directions, the Second World War started in Europe in September, 1939. On September 3, 1939, Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy of India, without consulting the Indian leaders announced that India was also at war with Germany. This declaration was a challenge to the Nationalist India. The Indian National Congress resented against the Viceroy's declaration. On September 15, 1939 the Congress Working Committee proposed to support the British in the war provided that the British Government declared their war aims, that they gave an assurance that independence

would be granted to India soon after the war and Indian Constituent Assembly elected to frame the constitution, and that during the war Indians would be included in the Central Government to share responsibility and power.<sup>28</sup> The Muslim League was ready to extend co-operation to the British Government if it recognised the League as the only organisation that could speak on behalf of the Muslims and if it gave an assurance that no declaration regarding the question of constitutional advance for India should be made without the consent and approval of the All India Muslim League nor any constitution be framed and finally adopted by the British Government without such consent.<sup>29</sup>

To rally the Indians to British support the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, in a statement issued on October 17, 1939 suggested the expansion of the Governor General's Executive Council and the formation of a war advisory body representative of the all major political parties in British India and of the Indian States.<sup>30</sup> Gandhi rejected this suggestion and stated that the Congress had asked for bread and got a stone.<sup>31</sup> The Congress Working Committee on October 22, 1939, described the Viceroy's statement as wholly unsatisfactory and called upon the Congress ministries to resign as a mark of protest.<sup>32</sup> On October 18, 1939 Jawahar Lal Nehru urged Jinnah to join Congress in protesting against the government's policy and appealed to him to extend his support to the Congress in an hour when India had been insulted by the British Government.<sup>33</sup> Jinnah did not support the Congress and tried to persuade the Congress leaders to agree to the Viceroy's proposal to expand the Executive Council subject to a settlement with the Muslim League in the provincial field. But the Congress was adamant.<sup>34</sup> And consequently the Congress and the Muslim League moved into opposite directions so much so that when the Congress ministries in the provinces resigned, Jinnah celebrated December 22, 1939 as a Day of Deliverance from the tyranny, oppression and injustice of the Congress Raj in the provinces.<sup>35</sup> This attitude of the Muslim League caused bitterness in the Congress Circle and Nehru wrote to Jinnah in December, 1939, "It thus seems that politically we have no common ground and that our objectives are different. That in itself makes discussion difficult and fruitless."<sup>36</sup> This difference between the Congress and the Muslim League widened in the years that followed.

In an article written on January 19, 1940 Jinnah claimed that Hindu and Muslims were two different nations and advocated the setting up, both at the centre and in the provinces, Governments that represented all the segments of Indian society and disapproved party government as unsuitable to Indian conditions.<sup>37</sup> The rift between the Congress and the Muslim League reached its height at the Lahore session of the All India Muslim League held in March, 1940 where the hope for a united India got an electric shock when the famous Pakistan Resolution was passed.<sup>38</sup> This was the parting of the ways between the Muslim League and the Congress which pointed out that these two organisations would not march together.

However, the Congress did not accept it that Hindus and Muslims constituted two nations. In his presidential speech at the Ramgarh session of the Congress held in March, 1940, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad emphasised the heritage of common nationality between Hindus and Muslims in India.<sup>39</sup> This Congress also declared that the involvement of India and exploitation of her resources in the war without the consent of the Indians was a challenge to the Indian people which they would not

tolerate and it decided to resort to civil disobedience.<sup>40</sup>

It was in such circumstances that the Viceroy made a statement on August 8, 1940. This August Offer made by the Viceroy affirmed by promise of Dominion status. The August declaration further stated that with least possible delay the British Government would set up a representative body to devise India's constitution. The Viceroy also gave the assurance to the Muslim League that the British Government would not contemplate transferring power to any system of government in India, the authority of which was denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life.<sup>41</sup>

This "August Offer" was rejected by the Congress. Nehru called it the final breaking of such slender bonds which held Britain and India together and characterised it as the end of the hope that Britain and India would march together.<sup>42</sup> The Congress Working Committee at its meeting on August 22, 1940 passed a resolution to the effect that British Government was unwilling to part with any power and that issue of the minorities had been made into an insuperable barrier to India's progress.<sup>43</sup> The All India Congress Committee decided in September, 1940 to launch individual civil disobedience in October, 1940. It was a protest against the unwillingness on the part of the British Government to shed even a part of its authority. Nearly 3,000 Congressmen courted arrest during the years 1940-41.<sup>44</sup> The Muslim League also rejected the August Offer as the Viceroy was not prepared to go so far as to give the League veto on the entry of Congress in the Executive Council.<sup>45</sup>

Meanwhile the war took a serious turn. France surrendered in June, 1940. Germany attacked Russia in June, 1941. Japan was rapidly expanding herself in Eastern Asia. With the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour on December 7, 1941, the United States entered into the war. In Asia, Japan consolidated her position and one by one nations began to collapse. Singapore surrendered to the Japanese on February 15, 1942. Rangoon fell on March 7, 1942. All these events compelled the British Government to realise the gravity of the situation and order to rally all the forces of Indian life to guard India from the menace of Japanese invasion, Cripps Mission was sent to India to discuss with Indian leaders the war situation and Indian Constitutional problems.<sup>46</sup> The Cripps Mission came to Delhi on March 22, 1942. After consulting the Viceroy, the Congress leaders and other parties in India, Sir Stafford Cripps published the Draft Declaration on March 30, 1942. The declaration stated that after the war was over, steps would be taken to set up in India a Self-Government by the creation of a new union which would constitute a Dominion, with a right to adhere or not to adhere to the British Commonwealth. It provided that upon the cessation of hostilities a new constitution would be framed and implemented with some reservations. The declaration recognised the right of any province of British India not to accept the new constitution. Furthermore, the declaration stated that until the constitution of India was framed, the British Government would bear the responsibility for the defence of India but the Government of India would take the task of organising to the full the military, moral and material resources of India with the co-operation of the people of India and the British Government asked for the immediate and effective participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the councils of their coun-

try, of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations.<sup>47</sup>

The Cripps proposals were rejected by the Indian leaders. Gandhiji described the pledge about future settlement of the Constitution as a post-dated cheque on a bank that was obviously failing<sup>48</sup> and told Cripps that "if this is your entire proposal to India, I would advise you to take the next plane home."<sup>49</sup> The Congress Working Committee in April, 1942 expressed its unhappiness at the Cripps proposals and declared that the acceptance of the novel principle of non-accession for a Province was a severe blow to the conception of Indian unity.<sup>50</sup> The Congress was also opposed to the proposals on the ground that 90 millions of the people of the Indian States were to have no voice in framing the constitution and the proposals relating to the immediate present were also vague. The Congress demanded an Indian Defence Member in the National Government. While these negotiations were going on between the Congress and Cripps, Maulana Azad, the Congress president, realised that new Government, which was to be formed during the war period, would not be a National Government with full powers and that it would not function like the British cabinet in its relation to the Viceroy because there was to be no diminution in the powers of the Viceroy till the war was over and the new constitution was framed. The Congress refused to join any government on this condition. Cripps, on the other hand, pointed out that this suggestion would be rejected by all minorities in India since it would subject all of them to a permanent and autocratic majority in the cabinet.<sup>51</sup> Thus, the Cripps proposals were rejected by the Congress.<sup>52</sup>

The Muslim League expressed its gratification that the possibility of Pakistan was recognised by Cripps when he recognised the right of any province not to remain in the Indian Union. Jinnah considered it a surrender to the concept of partition.<sup>53</sup> The Muslim League passed a resolution expressing gratification that the possibility of Pakistan was recognised by implication by providing for the establishment of two or more nations in India.<sup>54</sup> However the League rejected the offer because the Cripps proposals were not open to modification and that the talks had been carried on with the Congress leaders over the heads of the Muslims, and other parties had been utterly ignored.<sup>55</sup>

The failure of the Cripps Mission to end the deadlock in India caused widespread frustration. Nehru wrote: "The reaction was strong and bitter".<sup>56</sup> The All India Congress Committee in May, 1942 declared that it would no longer consider any scheme which retained any element of British authority or control in India. It further stated that it was only on the basis of independence that India could deal with Great Britain or any other nations.<sup>57</sup>

The growing menace of Japan and the hesitant mood of the British Government to grant concessions to India convinced the Indians that freedom was their only salvation. Gandhiji wrote on May 3, 1942: "The presence of the British in India is an invitation to Japan to invade India. Their withdrawal removes the bait. Assume, however, that it does not, free India will be better able to cope with the invasion. Unadulterated non-co-operation will then have full sway."<sup>58</sup> On July 14, 1942 the Congress Working Committee passed a resolution asking the British Government to withdraw and to transfer authority in India to Provisional Government representative of all important sections of the people of India, which would

later evolve a scheme by which a Constituent Assembly could be convened in order to prepare a constitution for the Government of India, acceptable to all sections of the people. Representatives of free India and representatives of Great Britain would confer together for the adjustment of future relations and for the co-operation of the two countries as allies in the common task of meeting aggression. The Congress Working Committee declared that it had no desire to embarrass Britain or other Allied powers in their Prosecution of war or to encourage Japanese invasion of India. The Committee agreed to the stationing of the armed force of the Allied powers in India in order to ward off the Japanese invasion. The Committee further warned the British Government that if it did not terminate its rule in India the Congress would be compelled to start a widespread struggle on non-violent lines under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi.<sup>59</sup> Again, on August 8, 1942 the All India Congress Committee passed the historic *Quit India* resolution. The resolution declared that the immediate termination of the British rule in India was an urgent necessity, both for the sake of India and for the success of the United Nations.<sup>60</sup> The All India Congress Committee also approved of a mass struggle on non-violent lines on the widest possible scale under Gandhi's leadership.<sup>61</sup>

The Government of India arrested Gandhi and all others who mattered in the Congress and thus provoked the whole nation. Large scale upheavels and disorders took place and people rose in revolt against the British Raj. Income tax offices, school and college buildings, post offices, railway and godowns became the common objects of mischief or arson.<sup>62</sup> The Government left no stone unturned to crush the people's movement.<sup>63</sup> The massive support of the people to the August Revolution of 1942 made it clear that India was no longer prepared to remain under the Yoke of British imperialism.

The Muslim League did not join the Quit India movement launched in August, 1942. Jinnah complained that the Congress by adopting the Quit India resolution had tried to coerce the British Government at a time while the latter was engaged in fighting the war into handing over the reins of the Government of India to the Congress and appealed to Muslims to keep completely aloof from the movement.<sup>64</sup> The Muslim League Working Committee at its meeting in Bombay on August 20, 1942 viewed the action of the Congress in asking the British to Quit India as a move to coerce the Government as well as the Muslims to submit to the demands of the Congress which aimed at the establishment of the Hindu Raj.<sup>65</sup>

The whole Congress leadership remained behind the bars till the end of the Second World War. It was in May, 1944 that Gandhi was released from the Jail on health grounds and on June 14, 1945, after Germany's surrender, the Government of India ordered the release of the members of the Working Committee of the Congress. During this period when all those who mattered in the Congress were in the Jails, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League dominated the political scene in India. The Muslim League demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims and the Hindu Mahasabha opposed this scheme. In his presidential address to the annual meeting of the Hindu Mahasabha held in December, 1942, Savarkar said that the "*Outrageous and treacherous*" demand for Pakistan would not be tolerated and there must be no secession, no right of provincial self-determination. "Such claims" Savarkar added, "would be put down as treason by the United strength of the

Central Government just as a movement for Negrostan would be punished by the American nation.<sup>66</sup>

But even during this period, some attempts were made for conciliation between the Hindus and Muslims. Rajagopalachari in a pamphlet entitled "The Way Out" published on November 30, 1943 renewed his plea for the acceptance of the scheme of Pakistan by the Hindus. He pleaded for concessions to the principle of self determination for minorities and states in a plan for a free and independent constitution and for the accommodation of the Muslim League upto the farthest possible limit and pointed out that non-co-operation in the cause of national freedom would be at best a poor and ugly sanction for the Muslim League.<sup>67</sup> At a time when these attempts were being made to placate the Muslims, the Muslim League at its Karachi session in December, 1943 adopted a new slogan, "Divide and Quit" as a counterpart of Gandhi's "Quit India." The League resolved to establish a Committee of Action to organise Muslims all over the country to resist the imposition of a unitary constitution and to prepare for the coming struggle for the achievement of Pakistan.<sup>68</sup>

Gandhi, who still believed in Hindu-Muslim unity, was eager for an understanding between the Hindus and the Muslims. After his release from Jail on May 6, 1944, Gandhi wrote to Jinnah requesting him to co-operate with the Congress.<sup>69</sup> Gandhi wanted to work out Rajagopalachari's scheme which was rejected by Jinnah because it offered "*a shadow and a husk, a maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan*". However he agreed to discuss the matter with Gandhi.<sup>70</sup>

Gandhi met Jinnah on September 9, 1944 and talked to him on Rajagopalachari's formula. Jinnah stressed that Pakistan should include Baluchistan, Sindh, North West Frontier Province, Bengal, Assam and the Punjab subject to territorial adjustments that might be agreed upon as indicated in the Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League in 1940. Gandhi insisted that only the Muslims living in Baluchistan, Sindh, North-West Frontier Province and parts of Punjab, Bengal and Assam, who desired to live in separation from the rest of India should form the new state. Gandhi wanted to concede Muslims demand for separation not because they formed a separate nation but only because they wanted to separate themselves from one family consisting of many members. Jinnah regarded the Indian Muslims as constituting a separate nation. Gandhi thought that the separate Muslim state should be formed after India was free, but Jinnah asked for an immediate and complete settlement. Gandhi suggested that there should be a treaty of separation to provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence communications, customs, commerce and a like matters, of common interests ; but Jinnah was clear that all these matters could not be delegated to any common central authority or Government. The suggestion of Gandhi created a suspicion in Jinnah's mind that Gandhi was still thinking in terms of some sort of a federal or confederal arrangement and not in terms of two sovereign, separate and independent states.<sup>71</sup> Jinnah rejected Gandhi's proposals and the Gandhi-Jinnah talks failed to solve the constitutional and political deadlock in India. In March, 1945 Jinnah declared, "Pakistan is our irrevocable and unalterable national demand... We shall never accept any constitution on the basis of a united India."<sup>72</sup> Gandhi-Jinnah talks were viewed with alarm and grave concern by the Hindu Mahasabha. Savarkar

made a scathing remark on Gandhi's offer to negotiate with Jinnah on the basis of partitioning India and emphatically stated that the Indian provinces "were not the private properties of Gandhi and Rajaji so that they could make a gift of them to anyone they liked."<sup>73</sup> Nevertheless, after the failure of Gandhi-Jinnah talks Tej Bahadur Sapru and Bhulabhai Desai made sincere attempts to bring about an agreement between the various political parties in India. The Muslim League rejected the proposals of Tej Bahadur Sapru because they recommended joint electorate but not Pakistan. Sapru's proposals were opposed by the non-Congress Hindus because they recommended parity between the Muslims and Hindus other than the scheduled castes.<sup>74</sup>

While the Congress and the Muslim League were standing poles apart on the issue of constitutional settlement and the war was going on without any hope of early termination, Lord Wavell, the Viceroy, visited London in March, 1945 and discussed Indian problems with the British Government. The British Government's proposals were published on June 14, 1945. The British Government proposed that the Central Executive should be constituted to include leaders of Indian political parties in such a way that a balanced representation was given to the main communities, including an equal proportion of Muslims and caste Hindus. It was proposed that external affairs should be placed in the hands of an Indian member of the Viceroy's Executive Council so far as British India was concerned and representative should be appointed to represent India abroad. No change in the relations of the Crown with the Indian states through the Viceroy as Crown representative was contemplated. All members of the Executive Council, except Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief, were to be Indians. In order to place these proposals before the Indian leaders and to find out the possibilities of the formation of a reconstituted Executive Council, the Viceroy called a conference at Simla on June 25, 1945, but no solution could be found as Jinnah refused to co-operate with the Viceroy's proposals if there was any non-League Muslim in the Viceroy's Executive Council.<sup>75</sup> Announcing the failure of the Simla Conference on July 14, 1945 Lord Wavell wrote: "Jinnah was so decided that I felt that it would be useless to continue the discussion".<sup>76</sup> Thus, till the end of the Second World War (Japan surrendered on August 15, 1945 no constitutional solution to Indian problems evolved. During 1930 and 1945 the nationalist movement in India consolidated itself but it was plagued by the Hindu-Muslim, Congress-League rivalry and antagonism. In 1930, the nation under the leadership of the Congress demanded complete independence and in 1945 it seemed that it could be achieved and independence seemed to be in sight. Azad had rightly observed: "the Simla Conference marks a breakwater in Indian political history".<sup>77</sup> The failure of the conference on account of Jinnah's persistent demands that non-League Muslims should not be included in the Viceroy's Executive Council indicated that the independence of India could be attained not only by the attempts of the congress. Indian struggle for freedom became tripartite struggle—an issue to be settled by the concerted efforts of the Congress, Muslim League and the British Government. By 1945, it seemed that India would soon get independence but it was not certain that India would remain a united nation.

The period from 1930 to 1945 marked the consolidation of the Indian National Movement and its attempts for close co-operation with the nations of Asia. During

this period Indian leaders formulated a well-knit Asian policy and evinced keen interest in the affairs of the Asian Countries.

*Indian and Ceylon:* Indian leaders desired to live in friendly bonds with the people of Ceylon. The only stumbling block in the way of good neighbourly relationship between the two countries was the presence of a large number of Indians in Ceylon which oft and often caused some sort of misunderstanding between the two peoples of Asia. Imbued with a sense of fellow-feeling with Ceylon Indian leaders made earnest attempts to remove this misunderstanding. The Indian Social Reformer emphasised the need of friendly relations between India and Ceylon and expressed the hope that the day was not far distant when Ceylon would be politically, as she was racially and culturally, an integral part of India.<sup>78</sup> At a time when the ill-feeling between the two neighbours was increasing on account of the Indian settlers in Ceylon, Subhas Chandra Bose sent his greetings to Lanka (Ceylon) Sama Samaj Party through Bikshu Sankara who visited Calcutta on the occasion of the meeting of the All India Congress Committee. In his message Subhas Bose emphatically stated: "Common aims and principles bind the freedom movement in our two countries. Besides, the people of Ceylon and of India can look back to a common culture and heritage and both our nations look forward to a bright and glorious future".<sup>79</sup> He further pointed out that one of the problems, which was causing anxiety to responsible people in Ceylon was the question of Indo-Sinhalese relations. This problem, he hoped, could be satisfactorily solved only through mutual goodwill, without the interference of the third party. He also appealed to the Indians living in Ceylon to look upon themselves as not as foreigners, but as children of the Soil and to serve the interests of the Sinhalese. If Indians would do so, Subhas Bose declared, they would certainly win the confidence, trust and goodwill of their Sinhalese brethren. He also urged upon the people of Ceylon to treat Indians not as undesirable aliens, but as people coming from the land of Buddha.<sup>80</sup>

The All India Congress Committee at its meeting in June, 1939, discussed the issue of Indo-Sinhalese relation and viewed with concern the measures proposed by the Ceylon Government with reference to the Indian employees and hoped that it would be possible to find a way to avoid the most undesirable conflict which would weaken the bond of fellowship between India and Ceylon. The Committee felt alarm at the misunderstanding between the two countries which were separated only by a strip of water and which had a common culture and which had been intimately connected since time immemorial. The Committee expressed desires to explore every possible means of avoiding a conflict and therefore appointed Jawahar Lal Nehru to go to Ceylon and confer with the authorities and representative associations and individuals and do all that might be possible to effect a just and honourable settlement.<sup>81</sup> The Committee's sincere desires to settle amicably the disputes between India and Ceylon were highly appreciated in India. Commenting upon the decision of the All India Congress Committee to send Jawahar Lal Nehru to Ceylon, Gandhi wrote that the Congress Committee had done well in choosing its best man to proceed to Ceylon "as the nation's ambassador of peace. It is, at least, it should be impossible for India and Ceylon to quarrel".<sup>82</sup> He further stated that Indians and Ceylonese were the nearest neighbours and the

inheritors of a common culture. Explaining the cultural and geographical proximity between the two nations Gandhi remarked, "But even as blood brothers sometimes differ so do next door neighbours. And like brothers, they usually adjust their differences and are the more closely knit together after the clearance. So may it be between Ceylon and India through the efforts of Jawaharlal Nehru."<sup>83</sup>

Nehru visited Ceylon in July, 1939 and was accorded warm welcome and hearty reception wherever he went in Ceylon. During his stay in Ceylon Nehru stressed the urgency of the freedom of Ceylon and assured the Ceylonese that no Indian could desire to exploit or to do injury to Ceylonese people. He also expressed the hope that no Ceylonese could also wish ill to Indians or to India.<sup>84</sup> On July 18, 1939 Nehru questioned by Pressmen in Colombo, whether he would succeed in his mission to Ceylon, said: "Ceylon is far too small, you know, to stand alone. She must for the sake of her trade have contacts with other countries and with what country should she have close contacts than with India."<sup>85</sup> Speaking on July 19, 1939 at Colombo Nehru made an appeal for friendship between India and Ceylon. On July 20, 1939 Nehru declared that whatever might be the result of his mission, he was glad and hopeful that his visit might help to remove the existing barriers of ill-feeling and suspicion and restore amity and understanding between Indians and Ceylonese.<sup>86</sup>

Nehru's visit to Ceylon paved the way for larger co-operation, mutual goodwill and understanding between the two countries. Commenting upon the impact of Nehru's visit to Ceylon, Lanka, Sundaram wrote that Nehru during his visit to Ceylon conquered the hearts of the five millions people of Ceylon and no Roman Emperor could have wished for a more triumphal tour of his state than what Nehru experienced during his eight days in Ceylon.<sup>87</sup> Though Nehru frankly admitted that the outstanding disputes between Indians living in Ceylon and the Ceylon Government had not been solved by his visit but he was hopeful that the visit had strengthened the relations between India and Ceylon. In an interview to the pressmen on July 25, 1939, Nehru stated that his visit had done good in improving the relations between India and Ceylon<sup>88</sup>, and had created an atmosphere of friendliness between the peoples of the two countries.<sup>89</sup> Indeed, Nehru's visit paved the way for closer relations between India and Ceylon and Nehru returned to India convinced that in any future order Ceylon and India must hang together.<sup>90</sup>

The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress in August, 1939 considered the situation in Ceylon as placed before the Committee by Jawahar Lal Nehru after his visit to the Island and expressed its regret that the Ceylon Government had not thought it fit to make any major change in the measure they had proposed in order to remove a large number of Indians from their employment though the Government had given assurances that all cases of hardship would be carefully considered by it. The Committee declared that the action of the Ceylon Government in respect of these measures was not in conformity with justice or international practice. The Working Committee assured the people of Ceylon of every sympathy with their national awakening and of every desire to co-operate in the solutions of economic and other problems which plagued Ceylon and India alike. The Committee desired that Indians living in alien lands must be treated honourably and with justice and it did not want Indians to go anywhere as un-

warranted outsiders who exploited the people of the country. The Committee recognised the right of the people of Ceylon to be given preference in state service and India was fully prepared to co-operate in this task. The Committee expressed its readiness to co-operate with Ceylon Government in all steps to adjust relationship so as to give every opportunity to the people of Ceylon to advance and find self-fulfilment. It further declared not to do anything which might put a strain on the cultural, historical and economic bonds which united India and Ceylon.<sup>91</sup>

Restrictive measures adopted by the Ceylon State Council produced an adverse reaction in India and the Indian leaders put pressure on the Government of India to take up vigorously the question of Indians in Ceylon which resulted in the banning in 1939 of all Indian emigration to Ceylon by the Government of India.<sup>92</sup> But this big issue confronting both India and Ceylon did not succeed in killing the friendly feelings between the peoples of the two countries. Some of the Ceylonese leaders desired to settle the issue of Indian settlers in a just manner and gave their support to Indian initiatives for Asian solidarity. Ceylon sent its delegates to the All Asia Women Conference held at Lahore in January, 1931 on the initiative of All India Women Conference and supported the Indian proposal to develop regular cultural contacts between the countries of Asia.<sup>93</sup> Mr. Colvin'd Silva, president of the Ceylon Socialist Party and D.C. Gunawardhena and N.M. Perera, socialist members of Ceylon State Council, came to India to attend the All India Socialists' Conference held at Faizpur. In a statement, the Ceylon leaders asked the people of India to reject the wrong notion that there was widespread anti-Indian feeling in Ceylon and assured the people of India the continued good-will of their countrymen.<sup>94</sup>

Fighting, as they were, for their independence against imperialism; the Indian Leaders expressed sympathy with the nationalist aspirations of the people of Ceylon. During the Second World War the Ceylonese gave full support to the war efforts of the Allied Powers as a result of which the British Government declared in 1943 that after the termination of the war it would grant Ceylon a full responsible Government under the Crown in all matters of internal civil administration. The British Government further declared that it would control the external relations and defence of Ceylon.<sup>95</sup> This offer was accepted by the Board of Ministers in Ceylon.<sup>96</sup> Indian public opinion, which felt a genuine interest in the affairs of Ceylon, advised the Ceylonese not to be too much optimistic about the British declaration which reserved foreign relations and defence of the country in the British hands. The *Modern Review* cautioned the Ceylonese about the inherent flaws in the declaration and wrote that the logical outcome of the policy, if adopted, could not but be the continued use of the colonies and other possessions of Britain as fields for exploitation and aggrandizement by the British people and all that this implied. It urged the Board of Ministers in Ceylon to profit by the bitter and sad experience of India in spheres of almost identical reservations, safeguards and conditions. In Ceylon it was essential that they should not only have a fresh election but there should also be a demand for a Constituent Assembly on the basis of adult franchise. Expressing sincere love for Ceylonese independence the *Modern Review* concluded : "In view of the numerous ties, such as geographical, racial, social, cultural, economic, etc., between India and Ceylon, it can not be

denied that the progress of the two countries are bound up each with the other. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that leaders of public opinion in the two countries should remain equally wide-awake and vigilant.<sup>97</sup>

India's urge for friendship with Ceylon and her desire to co-operate with Ceylon were expressed in the various schemes which the Indian nationalists drew up for the formation of an Asiatic Federation in which Ceylon was included as a constituent unit. Writing in 1940, Jawahar Lal Nehru advocated the formation of a federation of China, Burma, India, Afghanistan, Persia along with Ceylon.<sup>98</sup> Ceylonese leaders also appreciated such schemes envisaging close alliance between Nationalist India and Ceylon. Even during the stormy days of the Second World War Sanghamugha Das, a Ceylonese Trade Union leader, came to India to attend the 21st Session of the All India Trade Union Congress held at Madras in January, 1945. The Ceylonese delegate reiterated the close ties that held the people of India and Ceylon together. The people of Ceylon, Das added, were being kept in bondage by the same imperialist power which kept the Indians in bondage. Hence, the Ceylonese delegate assured the Indians that the Ceylonese people, would give their whole-hearted support to the cause of Indian Independence.<sup>99</sup>

Thus, despite the outstanding disputes arising out of the presence of a large number of Indians in Ceylon, the people of both the countries desired to live in friendly relations during the year 1930-45.

*India and Nepal* : Indians eagerly watched the developments in Nepal and elite opinion in Nepal developed a considerable respect for Indian Nationalist Movement. Democratic movement in Nepal got inspiration from India and the latter lent its support to this movement for democratic reforms in Nepal. "The Rana rule of Nepal and the British Rule of India formed, as it were". G.P. Bhattacharjee wrote, "one inseparable bloc against which the democratic movement of Nepal and the nationalist movement of India were directed."<sup>100</sup> Both the Indian Nationalists and the Nepalese reformers realised that the success of the one depended on the success of the other and hence they made efforts to co-ordinate their movements.

Elite opinion in Nepal developed a considerable respect for Indian nationalist movement. They were influenced by the various schemes of social and economic reforms introduced by Gandhi in India. In 1930, a group of Nepalese Youths under the influence of Gandhian thought, formed an association to make the people know about the evils of liquor, meat-eating, caste-system. But it was not only Gandhism which had an appeal to the Nepalese Youngmen. Revolutionary activities and the heroic exploits of Bhagat Singh and others aroused the Nepalese Youths from stupor. Consequently in 1931, under the able leadership of Khanda Man Singh, Khadga Man Singh and others, the Youths of Nepal organised a secret society called Prachanda Gorakha, on the lines of the revolutionary parties in India, in order to bring the Rana tyranny to an early end and to introduce democratic principles in the Government of the country. Another extremist organisation known as the Praja Parishad, which also aimed at the termination of the Rana regime, was established in 1935 in Kathmandu and the organisers worked under the inspiration derived from the Civil Disobedience Movement and the secret revolutionary activities in India in the early thirties of the 20th century.<sup>101</sup>

It would seem curious to note that whereas the agitators against the Rana rule in Nepal drew inspiration from Indian struggle for freedom, the Nepal Government enjoyed the confidence and sympathy of the Hindus organised under the banner of the All India Hindu Mahasabha. The 14th session of the All India Hindu Mahasabha held in September, 1932 at Delhi under the presidentship of N.C. Kelkar, noted with pleasure the accession to the post of Prime Ministership of Shamser Jung Bahadur Rana who attached much value to the solidarity of Hindus of Hindustan including Nepal and outside it and to the protection of Hindu culture, race and religion. Paying tributes to his qualities the Mahasabha prayed for the long life of the Prime Minister.<sup>102</sup> V.D. Savarkar, the president of the 19th session of the All India Hindu Mahasabha held at Ahmedabad in 1937 sent forth on behalf of all Hindus their loyal and loving greetings to the king of Nepal, the Prime Minister of Nepal and all co-religionists and countrymen there, who had, even in the darkest hour of history, been successful in holding out as Hindu power and in keeping a flag of Hindu Independence flying on the summits of the Himalayas. The Kingdom of Nepal, the resolution of the Hindu Mahasabha recorded, was the only Hindu Kingdom in the world whose independence was recognised by England, France, Italy and other great powers.<sup>103</sup> The attitude of the Hindu Mahasabha towards Nepal was based on narrow ground of religious and cultural similarity between India and Nepal but behind it also worked the motive to have friendly relations with a next door neighbour.

As the years rolled by and as the democratic movement in Nepal gathered momentum, the politically conscious Nepalese realised that the Rana Regime in Nepal could not be terminated as long as the British Rule would last in India. The British Government's full support to the Ranas in suppressing the agitations for democratic reforms in Nepal convinced the Nepalese that their movement for democratic reforms was closely intertwined with the Indian struggle for national independence.<sup>104</sup> This realisation of the common interest instigated the politically conscious Nepalese to take an active part in the Quit India Movement of 1942 and some of the outstanding leaders of the democratic movement of Nepal, such as B.P. Koirala, K.P. Upadhyaya, D.R. Regmi, were put in to Jail by the British Government. Mutual co-operation and sympathy developed to such an extent that when Jayaprakash Narayan, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and few other socialist leaders, who had fled to Nepal to escape arrest for their revolutionary activities during the Quit India Movement, were interned by the Rana Government in the Hanuman Nagar Jail, the local Nepalese people attacked the Jail and freed the Indian revolutionaries. The Rana Government became perturbed at this incident, arrested a number of persons and sent twentytwo persons to Kathmandu for trial.<sup>105</sup> Though this incident was small but it was pregnant with far reaching consequences and was a break through in Indo-Nepal relations.

The Government of Nepal, too, sometimes respected the sentiments of the Hindus of India. It was this respect for the Hindus in India that in 1940, when the Government of Nepal lent the Government of India eight thousand Gurkha troops, the former attached two conditions to the utilisation of Gurkha troops lent by the Government of Nepal. The conditions were that the Gurkha troops were not to be sent abroad outside India and within India they were not to be employed

against the Hindus. The second condition laid down by the Government of Nepal revealed the respect it had for sentiments of Hindus in India <sup>106</sup>

*India and Afghanistan:* In 1920's Nationalist India remained associated with the nationalist aspirations of the Afghan people and their liberal king, Amanullah, and expressed its concern over the troubles created in Afghanistan against the liberal reforms of King Amanullah. When the Afghan affairs were settled and Nadir Khan became the ruler of the country, Indian leaders expressed their goodwishes for Afghanistan's prosperity and asked the Afghan king not to undo the reforms introduced by king Amanullah.<sup>107</sup> Maulana Shaukat Ali, when interviewed by the Associated Press on his return from Kabul which he had visited as the guest of king Nadir Shah, declared: "In another five or ten years Afghanistan will be a country of which not only the Afghans but the Muslims of Asia will be proud."<sup>108</sup> The people in India viewed with satisfaction the establishment of a National Afghan University by king Nadir Shah. Appreciating the Afghan king for the establishment of the university, *The Modern Review* asked the Indian patriots to learn lessons from Afghan educational progress.<sup>109</sup>

Indian leaders reposed great faith in Afghanistan and stressed the need of developing close contacts with Afghan people. In 1930's when the Congress leaders were seriously considering the problem of India's defence they seemed to be confident that trouble would not come from the side of Afghanistan. Jawaharlal Nehru told the Indian people that Afghanistan had been closely associated with India in the past and urged the need to revive those links which connected India and Afghanistan.<sup>110</sup> The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress in July, 1938 passed resolution appreciating the action of the Afghan Government in abolishing the monopolistic arrangements made by them for controlling the export trade in dry fruits which were detrimental to the interests of Indian merchants in Afghanistan and India. The Committee welcomed the restoration of status quo which, the Committee hoped, would help to improve friendly feelings between the people of India and Afghanistan.<sup>111</sup> In fact, during 1930 and 1945 Nationalist India and Afghanistan remained sympathetic to each other.

*India and South East Asia:* Leaders of Nationalist India eagerly watched the developments in South-East Asia. Indian Nationalists were glad to learn in April, 1932 that the American House of Representatives had passed a bill providing for independence of the Philippines within eight years. *The Modern Review* appreciated this move of the American Government.<sup>112</sup> Expressing his pleasure at the new move of America, Gandhi said that though the Filipinos would not get complete independence in the immediate future, they were getting the "substance of independence."<sup>113</sup>

Jawaharlal Nehru, who had a genuine desire to develop good friendly relations with Asian countries, visited Malaya in 1937 where he was enthusiastically received by the people.<sup>114</sup> During his stay there, Nehru advised the Indians living in Malaya to make common cause with the Malaysians. Nehru's visit to the colonies of Penang, Malacca, Singapore the federated and unfederated Malaya states strengthened the bonds of friendship between India and these lands and went a long way in bringing together the people of India and Malaya in a common struggle against imperialism.<sup>115</sup>

When the dark clouds of the Second World War over-shadowed the destiny of the World and South-East Asian countries became the theatre of imperialists' struggle, the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress held in December, 1941 expressed its deep sympathy with the people of Malaya, Burma and East Indies in the trials and hardships they were facing as a result of the conflict between ambitious and imperialist nations of the world.<sup>116</sup> Despite its pre-occupations with its own problems the Indian National Congress did not forget the interests of the South-East Asian Countries even in the darkest hours. The All India Congress Committee held in August, 1942 also championed the cause of the freedom of all South-East Asian countries. The Committee declared, "The freedom of India must be the symbol of and prelude to the freedom of all other Asiatic nations under foreign dominations. Burma, Malaya, Indochina, Dutch Indies, Iran and Iraq must also attain their complete freedom. It must be clearly understood that such of these countries as are under Japanese control now must not subsequently be placed under the rule or control of any other colonial power."<sup>117</sup> One day before his arrest in Bombay in August, 1942, Jawaharlal Nehru told Shiva Rao, a correspondent of *The Hindu* that India would regard it as dishonourable betrayal of the Allied cause to negotiate a separate peace with Japan or any of the Axis power. The Congress desired to see the independence not only of India, but also of Burma, Malaya and the rest of Asia then under the Japanese control.<sup>118</sup>

Sympathy for South-East Asian countries was expressed by Indian nationalists in international conferences. Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit, who was a delegate to the International Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, stressed the need for the freedom of Burma, Indochina and East-Indies and emphatically stated that the colonies were out of place in the future world order.<sup>119</sup> On May 4, 1945, at San Francisco, Mrs. Pandit submitted a memorandum to the San Francisco Conference calling for an immediate declaration of India's freedom but she also spoke for those countries which like India were under the heels of alien domination. "I speak," she declared, "in particular for Burma, Malaya, Indochina and Dutch East Indies, all bound to my own country by the closest ties of historical and cultural kinship and which cherish aspirations to national freedom like our own. Liberation from Japan should mean for them, liberation from all alien imperialism so far as this conference is concerned."<sup>120</sup> She further warned the imperialist powers that there would be no real peace on this earth so long as the enslaved nations of Asia were denied justice.<sup>121</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru was very anxious about the fate of the countries belonging to South-East Asian region. In an interview to Paul Fang, special correspondent of the Central News Agency, China, he declared that the future of Asia would obviously be a knotty problem. The whole of South-East Asia or the parts thereof occupied by Japan would not settle down till the question of colonial determination was settled once and for all, and their natives were free.<sup>122</sup>

The *Hindustan Standard* shared the sentiments of the Indian people when it warned the imperialist powers not to attempt to restore their colonial system in South-East Asia. The paper wrote that this **Bourbon Restoration** was bound to meet with stern opposition. The paper emphatically stated that for Malaya, Indochina and East-Indies, there could be only one good, the creation of independent nations and warned the Western imperialists that any post war settlement that left unsolved

the basic question of freedom in the East was sure to give rise to widespread discontent that might blow up the entire structure of the World Security at any moment. India had a right to know, the paper added, what was going to happen in Burma, Malaya, Borneo and Siam because the happenings in these lands would also affect India's destiny.<sup>123</sup>

*India and Burma* : Of all the South-East Asian countries Burma aroused much sympathy of the Indian people who looked upon the Burmans as their close partners in the game of the liberation movement of their respective countries. From very inception the Indian National Movement had been sympathetic to the nationalist aspirations of Burma. But the presence of Indians in Burma sometimes caused a scratch on the surface of Indo-Burmese friendship. Despite this big obstacle in the way of friendly and good neighbourly relations between India and Burma, the Indian nationalists remained sympathetic to Burma in her struggle for freedom and made constant efforts to settle amicably the disputes arising out of the presence of a large number of Indian settlers in Burma. Burma also desired to be at friendly relations with Nationalist India.

It was in the wake of the political consciousness in Burma that a demand for separation of Burma from India began to register itself in Burmese politics because the curious thing about nationalism in Burma was anti-foreignism directed against the British but also directed against the immigrants from India.<sup>124</sup> The number of Indian immigrants, their powerful economic position, their transitory character and the appearance of exploitation caused bitterness against the Indians in the hearts of the Burmans who feared that their country might one day become a vassal state of an Indian commonwealth ruled by Indians.<sup>125</sup> It was in this background that the demand for separation raised its head. There started a strong demand for separation of Burma from India in 1930's. However, Burmese opinion was divided over the question of separation. There were three schools of opinion in Burma. Some desired that Burma should not be separated from India and should remain in Indian Federation. Rev. Maung Maungji, Rev. U. Ottama and U. So. Thein, belonged to this school which opposed the separation and favoured the close contact with India. A joint statement issued by Ba Naw's party, U. Chit Hlaing's Party, the G.C.B.A., the Minglun Sayadaw's Sangha Council and other anti-separation parties protested against the separation of Burma from India.<sup>126</sup> Speaking at Karachi session of the Indian National Congress in 1931 Maung Maungji favoured Burma's close association with India on both economic and political grounds and opposed separation of Burma from India.<sup>127</sup> U. Kyaw Myint in his speech in the Indian Legislative Assembly on March 16, 1931, declared that the vast majority of the Burmese people had been and would continue to be against separation.<sup>128</sup> Another section of Burmese population desired separation but also an assurance that Burma's Status thereafter would not, on the whole, be lower than that of India under the new constitution and in case the constitution offered her should be unacceptable she desired the door into the Federation to be left open to her. U. Ba Pe, a Burmese delegate at the Indian Round Table Conference, declared on January 16, 1931 that the desire for the separation of Burma from India was a universal desire in Burma but while some wanted separation then and Dominion Status later, others opposed immediate separation because they did not trust the British

people to give them Dominion Status thereafter.<sup>129</sup> There was a third current of opinion in Burma which held that should the constitution offered to separated Burma be unsatisfactory, the recourse should be had to agitation but not to entry into the federation. U. So Nyun, M.L.C. urged the Burmans that if the constitution given to a separated Burma were not acceptable then Burman should wreck it but that the idea of entering the proposed federation should be abandoned.<sup>130</sup>

Despite the divergent Burmese views on separation issue, the Simon Commission in 1928 recommended separation of Burma from India.<sup>131</sup> The Burma Round Table Conference (November, 1931-January, 1932) agreed upon the main lines of a constitution for Burma separated from India.<sup>132</sup> An election was held in November, 1932 to know the public opinion on the issue of separation. The anti-separationists won complete victory at the general election. But even these anti-separationists desired Burma to remain in Indian Federation with a right to secede from it. Burmese opinion swung back in favour of separation. In 1935 when the British India Act was passed, Burma was treated separately. Two years later Burma received a new constitution and was separated from India after a long association.

So far the question of separation of Burma from India was concerned Indian opinion on the subject was uniform and clear ; it was that the question was one for decision by the people of Burma alone but that adequate opportunity should be given them to express their views. During his visit to Burma in 1929, Gandhi, while stressing the need of friendly relations between India and Burma, advised the Indian settlers in Burma to take no sides in the controversy over separation and to leave the decision to Burmans alone. Burma, Gandhi declared, should have full self-determination in the matter.<sup>133</sup>

The Indian National Congress, the main plank of the nationalist movement in India, also adopted some sort of neutral attitude in this regard. At its forty-fifth session at Karachi in 1931, the Congress recognised the right of the people of Burma to claim separation from India and to establish an independent Burman state or to remain an autonomous partner in free India with a right of separation at any time they might desire to exercise it. The Congress however, condemned the endeavour of the British Government to force separation of Burma without giving opportunity to the Burmese people to express their views and against the declared wishes of their national political organisations. The Congress considered this endeavour as deliberately engineered and viewed it with concern that it aimed at the perpetuation of British imperialism in Burma and to make Burma along with Singapore the stronghold of British imperialism in Eastern Asia. The Congress further strongly opposed any British policy which would result in Burma being kept as a British dependency and in the exploitation of Burma's resources for British imperialist interests for it would be a menace to free India as well as to the other nations of the East. The Congress demanded that extra-ordinary powers given to the Government of Burma be withdrawn and the stricture passed on the Burmese national organisations that they were illegal, should immediately be removed so that normal conditions might be restored and future of Burma might be discussed by her people without hindrance in a peaceful atmosphere and the will of the Burmese people might prevail.<sup>134</sup> Thus, even the Indian National Congress also recognised the right of the Burmans to separate from India but the British support to the separation

move caused suspicion in the nationalist circle in India that the British wanted to exploit Burma after separating her from India.

Similar sentiments were expressed by other Indian leaders from different platforms. At the Indian Round Table Conference held in London in January, 1931, Indian delegates accepted the right of the Burmans to separate from India. Speaking at the Conference on January 16, 1931 Shiva Rao frankly declared : "At the outset I want to make it absolutely clear that in this vital matter which concerns the future of Burma, it is the wishes of the majority of the people of Burma alone which should be the guiding factor in arriving at a decision. Let Burma be separated from India if her people really want it. But first let us make sure of it by a local inquiry that they do."<sup>135</sup> Other Indian delegates, Dr. Moonje, Jayakar and M.A. Jinnah supported this point of view.<sup>136</sup> Mody, another Indian delegate, went to the length of saying that India too had an interest in the form of the future constitution of Burma, and that Burma and India also should have more than a vague assurance that the prospects of Constitutional advance towards responsible government would not be prejudiced by separation. "I do not suggest," he further stated, "that Indian interests should dominate the Burman point of view but India should certainly know what sort of constitution is to be given."<sup>137</sup> Sir C.P. Ramaswami Aiyer declared that the question of separation should not be finally settled till the full implications of separation were understood by Burmans and their wishes then ascertained.<sup>138</sup>

Even in the Indian Legislative Assembly on March 16, 1931, the Indian members reiterated the views of the Indian delegates at the Round Table Conference. B. Das declared, "If the people of Burma want separation let them have it by all means, but before that they must be promised Dominion Status and equal freedom as India will get."<sup>139</sup> Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar also agreed that it should be left to the Burmese to decide what they wanted but urged as most essential that they should have the opportunity to say what they wanted to say. He further stated, "They might like to remain in India in the Federation as other provinces would like to be; so there are various reasons why the real Burmese opinion should be taken in the matter and more essential than that is that, there should be free and full opportunity given to the Burmese people to give expression to their opinion."<sup>140</sup> Sir Abdur Rahim maintained that if the Burmans desired separation from India "We the Indians do not stand in their way, but there is absolute necessity for Burmese opinion being properly consulted before any definite decision is arrived at."<sup>141</sup> Joshi expressed the same view and said : "if Burma is to be separated, that separation in my judgment should take place in accordance with the wishes of the Burmese people. I am anxious that if Burma is to be separated at all Burma must be made a dominion with a separate seat in the League of Nations."<sup>142</sup> Ramaswami Mudaliar put forward that Burma, though she might not want to join the Federation on the same footing as the other provinces of British India, might nevertheless care to join on the same basis as an Indian state.<sup>143</sup> Like the Indian delegates at the Round Table Conference and the Indian members in the Central Legislative Assembly, Vallabhbhai Patel, an important Congress leader of India, stressed that before separation the wishes of the Burmese people must be ascertained. Speaking from the Presidential Chair of the Indian National Congress held at Karachi in 1931, Patel said : "As regards Burma, press censorship has rendered it impossible

for us to know the true situation there. Whether Burma should be separated from India or should be part of the free India is for the Burmese alone to decide. But it is our concern, indeed, it is the world's concern, to see that all sides are heard. The proposition that there should be a referendum of Burmese opinion seems to me to be eminently reasonable."<sup>144</sup>

In the course of discussion on a resolution moved by Burmese leader Maung Maungji, Aney took exception to the grant to Burma of the right to separate at will and inquired whether a similar right had been extended to other provinces in India. Jawaharlal Nehru explained that the case of Burma stood on a quite different level and should be treated as such. Both India and Burma, he said, were anxious to maintain very close relationship and hence Indians could not insist upon Burma remaining in the Indian Federation against her wishes. He further declared that the right of self-determination could not be enjoyed by other provinces in India.<sup>145</sup>

The Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry also passed a similar resolution on April 8, 1931. The Federation unanimously declared that the question of the Constitutional evolution of Burma should be left to the decision of the people of Burma. "There are ample indications to show," the resolution stated, "that responsible Burmese opinion is dissatisfied with the decision of the Round Table Conference and the Secretary of State's statement in the House of Commons on January 20, last (1931) to pursue separation without Dominion Status. The Federation considers that the proposed Federation of Indian states and provinces has created a new position under which Burma can join the federation with great advantage to herself. The Federation therefore urges that full facilities should be provided for the people of Burma to express their free opinion on this matter, a step rendered more difficult owing to the repressive laws now in force."<sup>146</sup>

Considerable section of the Press in India also supported the stand taken by Indian leaders on the issue of separation of Burma from India. The *Leader* dated March 19, 1931, appreciated the resolution moved by Kyaw Myint, a Burmese member of the Indian Central Legislative Assembly, in the Legislative Assembly regarding the separation of Burma because it approved the principle of self-determination for Burmans, expressed concern at the manner in which separation was being rushed through and urged the necessity of ascertaining the real desire of Burmans in the matter by means of a referendum.<sup>147</sup> The *Tribune* in its issue of March 19, 1931, declared that the question of separation was a question for the Burmans to decide.<sup>148</sup> The *Indian Daily Mail* maintained : "We have always held the view that it is for the Burmans to decide whether they should remain within the Indian Empire or outside it. It is certainly a reasonable suggestion that the opportunity should be given to the province of Burma to choose between going out of the federation or remaining within it."<sup>149</sup> The *Bombay Chronicle* pointed out that the only right course in this matter was first to complete a scheme for all India federation and then let the people of Burma choose between the autonomous membership of a free federation and separation on the basis of Dominion Status.<sup>150</sup> Justice reiterated the stand taken by the Indian delegates at the Round Table Conference and in the Legislative Assembly that separation was a matter to be decided by the Burmese people themselves and that if they stood for separation from India nothing should be permitted to stand in the way of separation.<sup>151</sup>

When separation of Burma from India became an established fact in 1937 the fund of goodwill for Burma in India had not exhausted. Still the Indians desired to live at friendly relations with Burma. Expressing this general desire of the Indians The Leader wrote : "Now that Burma has been separated and the new constitution has come into force, it is to be hoped that the two countries will maintain the cordial relations that have subsisted between them so long".<sup>152</sup> Ties between India and Burma were strengthened by Jawaharlal Nehru's visit to Burma after the separation of the latter from India. In Burma, he addressed over 300 meetings, met most of the important leaders of Burma and Indians settled in Burma.<sup>153</sup> Replying to a civic address presented to him by the Mayor of Rangoon Corporation, Nehru declared that he had come to Burma as "the bearer of a message of goodwill from India"<sup>154</sup> and added that Burma and India must still work together, though geographically separated, and appealed for co-operation and preservation of the friendly spirit between Indians and Burmans.<sup>155</sup>

All these facts revealed that Indians never stood in the way of the Burmans in the realisation of their national objectives. Beyond doubt, the Indians domiciled in Burma were anti-separationists and lent their support to the anti-separationists and to the anti-separation parties in Burma because they feared that separation would mean restrictions upon foreigners and Indian interests would suffer and their position would be weakened. However, Indian opinion on the subject of the separation of Burma had been uniform and clear and it always stressed that the question was one for decision by the people of Burma alone. What Indian public opinion had been demanding was that the question of separation should be left to the decision of Burmans, adequate opportunity should be given to them to express their views and that if the Burmans voted in favour of separation, Indians settled in Burma should have the same rights of citizenship and other privileges as other sections of the population.

Friendly relation between India and Burma was temporarily disturbed in 1938, when riots occurred in Burma. The riot was a religio-communal outbreak but it manifested "the anti-foreign feeling of the awakening Burman"<sup>156</sup> In the riot non-Muslim Indians were not molested. The riot caused unbounded misery to the Indians settled in Burma and a sense of insecurity prevailed among them. Indian public opinion took up the cause of Indians in Burma and urged both the Burmans and Indians to settle their disputes amicably. On August 18, 1938, Madras Legislative Council passed a resolution deploring the recent riots in Burma and hoped that effective measures to preserve life and property and to prevent the recurrence of the trouble would be taken. It recommended that a committee should be appointed to inquire into the disturbances and to suggest measures for permanent peace and goodwill between the Indians living in Burma and the Burmans. Rajagopalachari, the Chief Minister of Madras, accepting it whole heartedly on behalf of the Government, expressed sympathy with the victims and congratulated the Burma Government in having been able to restore peace and order.<sup>157</sup>

The All India Congress Committee in September, 1938 expressed its sympathy with the Indian sufferers during the riots that have broken out in Burma resulting in heavy casualties and loss of property. The Congress Committee trusted that there would be a thorough and impartial enquiry into the damage done to life and pro-

perty of the Indians and demanded assurance of the safety of life and property of the Indians who had settled in Burma for generations together without let or hindrance. While demanding protection of the rights and life of the Indians in Burma the All India Congress Committee reiterated the long tradition of friendship between the two countries and appealed to the Government and the people of Burma to see that nothing was done to disturb the happy relations subsisting between India and Burma. The Congress Committee also advised the Indian settlers in Burma to rely more upon their ability, by strictly just dealing to cultivate friendship with the Burmans than upon any aid that might be rendered by the mother country or the Government of India.<sup>158</sup> This attitude of the Congress indicated India's cherished desire to live at friendly terms with the neighbouring people of Burma.

The ill-feeling temporarily created by the riot did not estrange the relations between India and Burma. Friendship and goodwill for Burma continued in India. Subhas Chandra Bose, the president of the Indian National Congress for the year 1938, voiced the sentiments of the Indian people when he observed: "We cherish feeling of friendship, cordiality and esteem for Burma and her culture and civilisation with which we have so much in common. We also feel that Burma must have her freedom just as India must. But we expect our Burmese friends to do justice to the Indian minority."<sup>159</sup>

Nationalists in Burma also looked to India for inspiration and guidance. The Indian National Congress was source of inspiration to the Young Thakins, a group of nationalists in Burma, who were very popular and effective during the struggle for Burmese independence. The proclamations and methods of the Indian National Congress were studied, indeed often copied by the Burmese nationalist organisations. At a conference of the Dobama Asia Yone (Thakin Kodow Hmaing Group) held in April, 1939 the current programme of the Congress was placed before the conference by Thakins Aung San, Nu and others and adopted in toto.<sup>160</sup> Burmese nationalists not only derived inspirations from the Congress but also attended the meetings of the Congress to have a first hand knowledge of the working of the Indian nationalist party. In March, 1940 Aung San, Than Tun and a few others made a tour of India and attended the Ramgarh session of the congress and met Gandhi and Nehru.<sup>161</sup> These visits of the fraternal delegates from Burma contributed to strengthening of the relations between the two countries. Indian and Burmese nationalism, co-operated closely at a respectable distance in 1935.

Need for the Indo-Burmese co-operation was highlighted at the Tripuri session of the Indian National Congress, in 1939 when Satyamurti, a veteran Congress leader, appealed to the commonsense of the people of Burma to preserve the fraternal and harmonious relations between India and Burma.<sup>162</sup> Damodar Savarkar, a prominent leader of the Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement reiterated the need for co-operation between India and Burma and declared that towards the neighbouring states of Burma and Tibet, the policy of the Hindu Mahasabha would always be, so far as possible, of whole hearted friendship and if they liked even of a political alliance because India's interests and the interests of Burma and Tibet were not antagonistic.<sup>163</sup>

Not content with only voicing sympathy with Burma, the Congress leaders also thought in terms of some sort of Asiatic Federation in which Burma was to occupy

an important position. In 1940, when Jawaharlal Nehru advocated a scheme of Asiatic federation, Burma formed the part of that regional organisation.<sup>164</sup> The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress in December, 1941, despite its pre-occupations with its own problems, expressed deep sympathy with the people of Burma in the trials and hardships they were facing as a result of the world conflagration.<sup>165</sup> The All India Congress Committee in August, 1942 demanded the freedom of all Asian countries including that of Burma.<sup>166</sup>

Despite her own uncertain future, Nationalist India remained sympathetic to the national aspirations of the Burmese people. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit, on behalf of the India League of America and the National Committee for India's Freedom, submitted a memorandum to the San Francisco Conference on May 4, 1945 calling for an immediate declaration of India's freedom. While making attempts to enlist India's case for freedom, the Indian leader also demanded the freedom for Burma.<sup>167</sup> In an interview with Paul Fang, special correspondent of the Central News Agency, China, Jawaharlal Nehru stressed the need of the freedom of Burma.<sup>168</sup>

In the closing years of the Second World War the whole of Asia was seething with discontent and nationalist movements became intense everywhere. Keeping in view the political situation in Burma the British Government issued a White Paper for Burma in 1945 in which the Governor's personal rule was envisaged for Burma for three years at the end of which elections were to be held and thereafter Burma was to get self-rule. The White Paper prescribed the steps and phases by which full self-government within the British Commonwealth would be established in Burma proper. The White Paper also made the Scheduled Areas inhabited by the indigenous races of the highlands subject to a special regime under the Governor until such time as their inhabitants signified their desire for some suitable form of amalgamation of their territories with Burma proper.<sup>169</sup> The Anti-Fascist Peoples' Freedom League of Burma and Aung San, one of the topmost nationalist leaders of Burma, resented the provisions of the White Paper.<sup>170</sup> Indians, who had stood both in weal or woe with the Burmese people, expressed resentment against the White Paper. Moved by a friendly feeling towards Burma, Jawaharlal Nehru commenting upon the White Paper on June 25, 1945 remarked at Bombay that it seemed to be a completely unsatisfactory document. If the British Government desired to meet the wishes of the Burmese people, Nehru declared, the former would have to revise its policy.<sup>171</sup> It was this intense love and sympathy for Burma and other South-East Asian Countries that prompted the Congress Working Committee in June, 1945 to instruct the Congress participants in the Simla Conference to make it crystal clear that upon the conclusion of the war in South-East Asia, the Indian Government could not support a policy of continuing imperialist control in the countries of South-East Asia of which Burma formed an integral part.<sup>172</sup> Thus, inspite of its pre-occupations with its own freedom struggle and the difficult situations arising out of the presence of Indians in Burma, the Indian Nationalist Movement, on the whole, remained sympathetic to Burma in her national aspirations.

*India and the Middle East :* With the opening of the 20th century a new sort of relationship developed between India and the countries belonging to West Asia. The Middle Eastern Countries placed under the Mandatory control of the western imperialists were fighting for independence. Nationalist India looked upon them

as brothers-in-bondage. India was involved in this region through its Muslim population and Indian Muslims and their premier organisation. The All India Muslim League, kept a watchful eye on the developments in the Middle Eastern countries and expressed their solidarity with these countries with whom they had cultural, religious and emotional attachment. As the Asian mindedness of Muslims was narrowly restricted to places and ideas connected with Islam,<sup>173</sup> the Muslims of India evinced a keen interest in the Muslim countries of Asia. Indian Muslims had, however, no monopoly over this relation with Middle Eastern Countries. Even the Hindus and the Indian National Congress rallied to the support of the countries belonging to this region.

The plantation of the Jewish Home in the heart of the Muslim Countries caused unlimited annoyance to the Arab countries and Palestine problem became a cancer in the body of Middle Eastern politics. The British policy of placating the Jews and the huge number of Jews immigration in Palestine caused ill-feeling between the Jews and the Arabs and sometimes sporadic outbursts of communal frenzy were the results. The Jews claimed a national home in Palestine which the Arabs considered as an infringement of their rights.

Indian Muslims, like the Arabs, believed that there would be no peace in Palestine until the Balfour Declaration was scrapped and in this demand the Indian Muslims were supported by the non-Muslim communities in India. The Executive Board of the All India Muslim Conference held at Simla on September 8, 1929 emphatically protested against the aggressive Zionist Movement in Palestine being allowed to interfere with the existing rights of Muslims in their sacred places of worship and regarded the existing unhappy Jewish-Arab situation in that state as the inevitable effect of the Balfour Declaration whereby outside influence was enabled to rouse dreams and aspirations among the Jews in Palestine for a separate home state and outside influences had embittered the hitherto harmonious relation between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine. The Board offered heartfelt sympathy to their co-religionists in Palestine in their sufferings resulting from the unhappy occurrences on the issue of Wailing Wall and hoped that the British-Government as the Mandatory power would not only abstain from encouraging the Zionists in their aggressive attitude but would also take steps to bring about a speedy establishment of a truly representative democratic government as demanded by the Arab population.<sup>174</sup> The Ulema Conference held at Kanpur in December, 1929 expressed dissatisfaction with the British Mandate and urged that Palestine be constituted as a free self-governing country.<sup>175</sup>

Palestine problem agitated the Indians in general and the Indian Muslims in particular. The ever increasing number of Jewish immigrants in Palestine posed a serious threat to the Arab Community in Palestine. Indian support was entirely on the side of the Arabs and the Indians considered the establishment of Jewish national home as an imperialist device to divide the people of the Middle East to which the Jews had become a party. The All India Muslim Conference held on February 15, 1934, requested the Aga Khan to pay particular attention to the Palestine problems.<sup>176</sup> The Council of the All India Muslim League held at Delhi in April, 1934 strongly supported the proposal of a strong and influential delegation to wait on the Viceroy to lay before him as to how the Balfour Declaration had

supported the Jews of the World to buy land and settle down in Palestine which would deprive the original inhabitants, namely the Muslims and Christians and Arabs and ruin the peace of the sacred land. The Council expressed its sympathy with the Arabs in Palestine and assured them of its heart felt concern and support.<sup>177</sup>

The increase in Jewish immigration was followed by violent Arab, attacks on government policy and it was alleged that the Government desired to drive the Arab nation away from its homeland. They organised an Arab High Committee consisting of all Arab parties. Disturbances began on a large scale in April, 1936 and the Arabs attacked the Jews and resorted to a general strike throughout the country. The country was convulsed by civil war and revolution.<sup>178</sup> The British Government decided to appoint a Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel to investigate into the Palestine affairs and to suggest measures to solve them. The Muslims of India viewed with relief the appointment of the Commission. *The Star of India*, a Muslim daily newspaper, appreciated the wisdom of the British Government in deciding to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate into the causes of the disturbances in Palestine.

Jawaharlal Nehru, who was well versed in international politics, expressed his sympathy with the Palestine Arab Movement against imperialist designs of the West. In spite of his sympathy for the poor plight of the Jews in the world his sympathies were entirely on the side of the Arabs. He maintained that few could withhold their deep sympathy from the Jews who had undergone centuries of oppression and who were undergoing a very severe trial in Germany yet he made it clear that no one could sympathise with the Zionist movement aiming at the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine under the protection of British imperialism. Nehru regarded the Balfour Declaration as a gross betrayal of Arabs by British imperialism. Admitting that the Jews had a right to visit Jerusalem as a holy land, he stated that Palestine was a holy land for the Arabs, Muslims, and Christians as well who had been the sons of the soil for the last thirteen hundred years or more. It was possible for some Jews to go to Palestine and settle there in an amicable manner but if they desired to go there with the object of dominating the country and establishing their stronghold there it was vain attempt to expect that the Arabs would welcome them. To Nehru the problem of Palestine was a nationalist one; for the Arabs were fighting against imperialist control. It was therefore a pity, that instead of aligning themselves with that struggle against imperialism, Nehru pointed out, the Jews of Palestine had taken the side of British imperialism and desired its protection against the natives of the country.<sup>179</sup> Stepping in the shoes of Nehru the Congress Working Committee held on July 1, 1936 sent its greetings and full sympathy to the Arabs in Palestine in their struggle for independence against British imperialism.<sup>180</sup>

To express sympathy for the Arabs in Palestine the Muslims of U.P. organised the Provincial Palestine Conference at Allahabad on July 18, 1936. Maulana Qutubuddin Abdul Wali, the president of the Conference, lamented that after making a number of promises to the Palestinian Arabs, Britain, unmindful of those promises, was using the Jews as instruments for strengthening her hold upon Palestine and congratulated the Palestinian Arabs for their brave stand against tremendous

odds.<sup>181</sup> Nehru in his message to this Conference expressed his sympathy and solidarity with the Arabs, who were fighting bravely for the freedom of their country. This struggle, Nehru emphatically stated, had nothing to do with religion. It was not against the Jews. It was a national struggle in which the Arabs of different faiths were joining hands for the common object of securing independence for their country. "And, thus there is much in common between their struggle and ours", Nehru remarked, "and even on the narrow grounds of self interest we in India should support and sympathise with the Arabs. I trust that this Arab struggle in Palestine will help us to see our own struggle in a proper perspective and make us forget our internal divisions in the face of common adversary."<sup>182</sup> The Sindh Congress Socialist Conference held at Karachi on July 18, 1936 under the presidency of M.R. Masani sent its greetings to the Arabs in Palestine and hoped that they would keep up the fight till their objective of an independent Palestine was achieved.<sup>183</sup>

Sympathy for the Arabs in Palestine was felt by all sections of people in India. Maulana Ahmed Sayeed, the president of the first session of the Bihar Muslim Independent Party Conference held at Patna on September 12, 1936 criticised the British Government's policy in regard to Palestine.<sup>184</sup> Asaf Ali tabled an adjournment motion in the Legislative Assembly on September 11, 1936 to discuss the failure of the Government of India in inviting the attention of the British Government to the danger of pursuing the policy of denying the indigenous population of Palestine their legitimate right of self determination.<sup>185</sup> Sir, Md. Yakub raised the Palestine issue on September 14, 1936, in the Indian Legislative Assembly. Jinnah and Shaukat Ali asked the Government of India to clarify the British policy towards Palestine.<sup>186</sup>

To express its solidarity with the Arabs in Palestine the Indian National Congress observed on September 26, 1936, as Palestine Day on which meetings and demonstrations in favour of the Arabs were held all over the country.<sup>187</sup> A mass meeting was held at Allahabad in support of the Arabs. Speaking on the occasion Jawaharlal Nehru observed that in Palestine the problem was one of the Arabs and Jews but it was never a religious problem as some of the Indian Muslims thought it to be. It was a problem of growing nationalism desiring freedom and being suppressed by imperialism. Nehru appreciated the brave Arab people for putting up valiant fight in the cause of national independence. Expressing his heartfelt sympathy with the Arabs Nehru declared, "Our sympathies and good wishes must go out to the people of Palestine in this hour of their distress. The crushing of their movement is a blow to our nationalist struggle as well as to their's. We hang together in this world struggle for freedom".<sup>188</sup>

A resolution conveying Bombay citizen's full sympathy to the Arabs in Palestine was adopted at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee to celebrate Palestine Day. In a short speech, Sarojini Naidu stated that the fight against imperialism was a world fight and therefore, it was the moral duty of the exploited people like Indians to sympathise with the Arabs fighting for independence from British domination.<sup>189</sup> A meeting of the Executive Board of the All India Muslim League viewed with grave concern and abhorrence the happenings in Palestine and the attitude of the British in crushing the legitimate aspirations of the Arabs and in enforcing Jewish immigration n

Palestine against the principle of self-determination. A warning was struck to the Government of India that this policy would cause disastrous repercussions throughout the Islamic world including India. The resolution further asked the British Government to make a prompt change in their policy in Palestine.<sup>190</sup>

A Muslim delegation headed by Md. Yakub submitted an appeal on September 28, 1936 to the Viceroy urging a revision of repressive British policy in Palestine.<sup>191</sup> A meeting of the Working Committee of the Central Jamiat-ul-ulema-i-Hind held at Kanpur called upon the British Government to fulfil the Arab demands. Expressing sympathy with the Arabs the Committee emphasised the need of a medical mission and financial help to Arab High Committee of Palestine.<sup>192</sup> The Working Committee of the Bengal Muslim Youngmen's League at Calcutta on October 1, 1936 viewed with alarm the attitude of the British Government as the mandatory power in Palestine and recorded its protests against the promulgation of the Martial Law for the suppression of the Arabs' struggle for their legitimate rights. The Committee also expressed its sympathy with the Arabs and urged the Muslims of India to help the Arabs in every possible way.<sup>193</sup> A meeting held at Birbhum on October 14, 1936 strongly protested against the action of the British Government in Palestine and requested the Viceroy of India to consider the seriousness of the situation and to request the British Government to change its policy and congratulated the Arabs for their heroic struggle for the freedom of their motherland.<sup>194</sup> The three day session of the All India Palestine Conference held in November, 1936 sympathised with the Arabs and protested against the pro-Jewish policy of Britain.<sup>195</sup>

The Royal Commission's report was published in July, 1937. The report stated that the promises made to Jews and Arabs were irreconcilable and the Mandate in its existing form was unworkable. The Royal Commission, therefore, proposed the division of the country into a Jewish and of an Arab states, with a small residuary enclave from Jaffa to Jerusalem left in charge of the Mandatory. When the Indians came to know of the British move to divide Palestine, the various political associations came forward to support the cause of the Arabs and the Royal Commission's recommendation to partition Palestine was highly resented by the Indians. The Provincial Ahrar Conference held at Lucknow on April 19, 1937 protested against the pro-Jewish policy of the British Government in Palestine and demanded that the Arabs should be allowed to lead a free life.<sup>196</sup> On August 1, 1937 a meeting of the Muslims of Calcutta protested against the plan of partitioning Palestine into two parts.<sup>197</sup> Addressing the All India Palestine Conference held in September, 1937 to express sympathy with the Arabs in their fight for freedom Shaukat Ali declared that every Muslim in India felt strongest sympathy for the brave Arabs. A.R. Siddiqi, the president of the Conference, urged the Muslims of India to raise their voice in unison with the rest of the Muslim World against the contemplated amputation of Palestine and warned the British Government that it would be wrong to put eighty millions of Indian Muslims into the difficult position of choosing between loyalty to their state and loyalty to their faith.<sup>198</sup>

The Conference urged upon the Government of Britain to revise its Middle Eastern policy and recommended that the Arabs be invited in accordance with the Solemn understandings entered into with them and the pledges given to the Muslim

World to establish a free and independent form of democratic government of their own choice with adequate safeguards for non-Arab minorities, should be fulfilled. The Conference requested the Aga Khan to place before the Assembly of the League of Nations the sentiments of India and the Muslim world on the question of Palestine and to see that the fundamental principle of the Covenant was implemented in the case of Palestine. The Conference further decided to send a Deputation to Muslim countries and Europe to represent the Indian viewpoint in regard to Palestine and to seek the annulment of the scheme of its partition.<sup>199</sup>

Muslim members of the Central Legislature in India in a statement on October 10, 1937 noted with concern the developments in Palestine and expressed their sympathy with their Arab brethren in the great fight against the heavy odds to safeguard legitimate rights and to save the Holy land from Zionist aggression and demanded that the whole of Palestine be handed over to the Arabs, sons of the soil and the mandate in Iraq be terminated.<sup>200</sup> The All India Shia Political Conference held at Lucknow on October 12, 1937 condemned the Royal Commission's recommendation for the division of Palestine.<sup>201</sup> Raja of Mahmudabad, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the twenty-fifth session of the All India Muslim League held at Lucknow in October, 1937, pointed out that Indian Muslims were anxiously watching the developments in Palestine and warned the British Government that any further inroads upon the rights of the Arabs of Palestine would start a conflagration which would lead to disastrous results.<sup>202</sup> In his presidential address Jinnah told the British Government that the question of Palestine, if not fairly met, boldly and courageously decided, was going to be the turning point in the history of the British Empire. He further asked the British Government to fulfil the promises made to the Arabs and warned the British Government that Great Britain would be digging its grave if she failed to honour her original proclamations and promises. Expressing India's support to the Arab cause Jinnah stated: "The Muslims of India will stand solid and will help the Arabs in every way they can in their brave and just struggle that they are carrying on against all odds."<sup>203</sup> The All India Muslim League wished that the recommendations of the Royal Commission should not be complied with for they were opposed to the religious sentiments of the Muslims.<sup>204</sup>

The Indian National Congress regarded Palestine as the home of the Arabs where the Jews should enjoy special privileges. The All India Congress Committee at its meeting at Calcutta in October, 1937 recorded its emphatic protest against the reign of terror that had been established in Palestine by British imperialism with the single object to coerce the Arabs to accept the proposed partition of Palestine and assured the Arabs of India's help in their struggle for national freedom.<sup>205</sup> The fifty-first session of the Indian National Congress held in February, 1938 condemned the plan for partition of Palestine, protested against the repressive policy of Britain and expressed sympathy with the Arabs. It suggested that the only proper method to solve the Arab-Jewish conflict was peaceful settlement between the two communities and appealed to the Jews to realise the gravity of the situation and not to seek the shelter of the British mandatory administration and not to become instrumental in the exploitation in the interest of British imperialism.<sup>206</sup> Addressing the Peace and Empire Conference in London on July 15, 1938 Nehru held the British Imperialism responsible for the unrest in Palestine and suggested that the Palestine

problem could be solved only when the Arabs and the Jews would forget their differences and would come to an agreement with each other. He further pointed out that the issue could be solved only by the two parties coming together and not by British imperialism.<sup>207</sup>

To express India's solidarity with the Arabs Palestine Day was observed at Calcutta on August 7, 1938. A public meeting held at the Town Hall expressed its indignation at the British policy in Palestine and pledged fullest support to the Arabs of Palestine in their valiant fight for freedom.<sup>208</sup> A mass meeting held at Calcutta on August 26, 1938 condemned the imperialist and anti Arab policy pursued by the British Government in Palestine and expressed the view that the establishment of an independent national government in Palestine, with adequate safeguards for the minorities and the termination of the Mandate were the only solutions for the restoration of peace in Palestine. The meeting sent its fraternal greetings to the Arabs in Palestine and wished them success in their unequal fight against the forces of imperialism.<sup>209</sup> Not only at Calcutta but all over India Palestine Day was observed on August 26, 1938. Thousands and thousands of meetings were held and lent their support to the Arabs who were fighting for their country's freedom.<sup>210</sup>

Indians were so much agitated over the fate of the Arabs in Palestine that they could not afford to miss any opportunity when they could have exhibited their support for the Arab cause. An Indian delegation also attended the World Parliamentary Congress of Arab and Muslim countries for the Defence of Palestine which met in Cairo in October, 1938. The Sindh Provincial Muslim League held at Karachi on October 8, 1938 prayed for the success of this world conference in achieving a satisfactory solution of the Palestine problem. The League Conference declared that to achieve a lasting settlement of Palestine issue, it was highly essential that the British Government should invalidate Balfour Declaration, withdraw the scheme of partition of Palestine as recommended by the Royal Commission and confer full independence upon Palestine.<sup>211</sup> M.A. Jinnah, who presided over the Sindh Muslim League Conference, referred to the ruthless suppression of the Arabs by British imperialism and declared that the heart of every Mussalman of India was with the Arabs in their brave and outstanding struggle.<sup>212</sup>

Gandhiji also condemned the persecution of the Jews in Germany in an emphatic manner and was opposed to the idea of a Jewish National Home and asked the Jews to make that country their home where they were born, brought up and where they earned their bread. "Palestine belongs to the Arabs", observed Gandhi, "and any Jewish immigration there should not result in a National Home; Zionist or Arab violence is wrong and Zionism, if persisted in, will cause the World-wide expulsion of the Jews to their National Home or at least raise the problem of dual political allegiance."<sup>213</sup> Gandhi detested the manner in which Arabs and Zionists were proceeding and also criticised Arab excesses and advised the Jews in Palestine to give up their reliance on force and try to win Arab heart. Gandhiji firmly declared that Palestine belonged to the Arabs in the same sense that England belonged to the English or France to the French.<sup>214</sup> Like Gandhi, Nehru, was also sympathetic to the Jews for their pitiable lot caused by the Jews-hunting in Germany but he was opposed to the plan of a Jewish national home in an Arab land. "Palestine is an Arab country", remarked Nehru, "and Arab interests must prevail there."<sup>215</sup>

In his presidential address to the annual session of the All India Muslim League held at Patna in December, 1938, M.A. Jinnah appreciated the heroic fight given by the Arabs against the British imperialism and assured the Arabs that India's sympathies were with them and declared that Muslims of India would not shirk from any sacrifice if required to help the Arabs.<sup>216</sup> On January 31, 1939, H.S. Suhrawardy, Secretary of Bengal Provincial Muslim League, issued an appeal stating that Palestine Day should be observed on February 8, 1939 throughout India to express the solidarity of the Indian Muslims with the Arabs in Palestine.<sup>217</sup> According to the programme of the All India Muslim League on February 8, 1939 over sixty thousands Muslims of Calcutta, Howrah, 24 Paraganas and suburbs demonstrated solidarity of Muslim India with the United Arab Front by taking part in the demonstrations, processions and meetings held to celebrate All India Palestine Day. The demonstrators paraded placards and raised slogans like "Falistan Azad, Bartania Barbad", "Down with British Imperialism", "Down with Zionism", "Muslim India solidly behind Palestine Arabs", "Down with the British Mandate".<sup>218</sup> Palestine Day was observed at Dumka, Chapra, Madras and resolutions sympathising with the Arabs were passed.<sup>219</sup> In Bihar, Palestine Day was observed at Jehanabad, Rangpur, Muzaffarpur and resolutions supporting the Arab demands and assuring India's solidarity with the Arabs were adopted.<sup>220</sup>

The Jamiat-ul-ulema-i-Hind Conference held in March, 1939, urged the fulfilment of the Arab demands for the constitution of Palestine into self governing state and the complete stoppage of Jewish immigration into Palestine.<sup>221</sup> The U.P. Muslim League held at Gorakhpur on March 18, 1939 regarded Palestine issue not only as a problem of the Arabs but of the entire Muslim world.<sup>222</sup> The annual session of the Indian National Congress held in 1939 sent greetings and good-wishes to the Arabs and wished them success.<sup>223</sup> The Council of the All India Muslim League held in April, 1939 placed on record its deep sense of sorrow at the sad demise of the Shah of Iraq and conveyed its sincere sympathy to the members of the Royal family and the people of Iraq in their tragic loss.<sup>224</sup> Sikandar Hyat Khan, the president of the Bombay Muslim League Conference held in May, 1939 at Sholapur, declared that the Muslims of India had deep friendly feelings for the Arabs in Palestine and urged the British Government to settle the Palestine issue in a just manner.<sup>225</sup> The Sindh Provincial Ahrar Conference held at Karachi on June 12, 1939, expressed sympathy with Palestine Arabs in their struggle for freedom.<sup>226</sup>

Deteriorating law and order situation and perpetual struggle between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine compelled the British Government to announce a new policy in May, 1939. The 1939 White Paper proposed to create an independent Palestinian state in treaty relations with British at the end of ten years. Seventy-five thousand Jewish immigrants were to be admitted in the first five years, after which further immigration was to depend on Arab consent.<sup>227</sup>

The 1939 White Paper on Palestine was a deep shock to the Indian people. The Working Committee of the All India Muslim League held in July 1939 at Bombay stated that the proposals embodied in the White Paper were most unsatisfactory and disappointing and were totally unacceptable. The Committee urged the British

Government to meet the Arab demands and appointed a committee to collect funds for the relief of the Arab sufferers in Palestine.<sup>228</sup> An emergent meeting of the Working Committee of the All India Muslim League held in Delhi on September 18, 1939 pointed out that the policy of the British Government towards the Palestinian Arabs had wounded deeply Muslim sentiments and urged upon the Government of Britain to satisfy the Arab national demands.<sup>229</sup> In a letter to the Viceroy, Jinnah impressed upon the Government that a solution of the Palestine issue should be found to the satisfaction of the Arabs.<sup>230</sup> Speaking from the presidential Chair in the twenty-seventh session of the All India Muslim League held at Lahore in March, 1940 M.A. Jinnah asked the British Government to reach a settlement on Palestine issue satisfactory to the Arabs and also urged the British Government not to send Indian troops against any Muslim country.<sup>231</sup> The Conference viewed with alarm the inordinate delay on the part of the British Government in coming to a settlement with the Arabs in Palestine. The Muslim League recorded its considered opinion that no arrangement of piecemeal character would be made in Palestine which were contrary to the pledges given to the Muslim World, and particularly to the Muslims in India during the First World War.<sup>232</sup>

During the stormy days of the Second World War when Germany attacked Russia, then one of the only two routes by which contact between Russia and Britain could be established was through Persia, where the Germans had been building up their staffs of technicians and spies. Russia and Britain made a joint demand that the Persian Government should expel them but the Persian Government replied that Persia alone would decide about the foreigners to be expelled. This reply caused the joint Anglo-Russian invasion of Persia in August, 1941 at a time when Reza Shah, the ruler of Iran, was facing troubles created by the unruly tribes. By September, 1941, Reza Shah was forced to abdicate in favour of his young son.<sup>233</sup> The humiliating treatment meted out to Iran by Britain and Russia caused widespread uproar in India and the Muslims of India condemned the unprovoked invasion of Iran by Britain and Russia. The Working Committee of the All India Muslim League in August, 1941 viewed with alarm the invasion of Iran by Britain and Russia and declared that the Mussalmans of India were greatly perturbed at the military occupation of certain Muslim states by Great Britain and her allies. The Committee warned the Government of India that this action of the Allies would complicate the Near East situation and would alienate the sympathies of Muslims of India and create bitterness in their hearts which would result in the withdrawal of every help by them to the Allied cause.<sup>234</sup> In October, 1941, Jinnah declared that if the British Government did not make it clear as to what their intentions were regarding Muslim states and also that they had no designs on their sovereignty and independence, it would be very difficult to control Muslim India any more.<sup>235</sup> The Council of the All India Muslim League considered the entry of the British and Soviet troops in the Kingdom of Iran as an act of open aggression and in view of the existing conditions, believed that the European Governments were determined to bring all the Islamic countries under their heel for their own selfish ends, and therefore, the Council warned the British and the other European Governments that the Mussalmans of India would not tolerate any foreign power's interference in any of the Islamic Countries.<sup>236</sup>

The intensity of Indian Muslim's feeling for the peoples of West Asia was amply demonstrated by the two events which occurred in the Muslim League session in October 1941. When the Council of the All India Muslim League was reviewing the situation in Iran, Shaikh Ahmed from Punjab attempted to argue that there was no need of passing any more resolution, he was interrupted with shouts of "Sit Down, we do not want to hear you". Another incident took place when Sikandar Hyat Khan, the Premier of Punjab, attempted to stop the League from adopting a resolution on Iran stating that Reza Shah was pro-Nazi and the people of Iran did not like him, he was greeted with prolonged shouts of "we do not want any attack on Reza Shah".<sup>237</sup>

The All India Azad Muslim Board in March, 1942 recorded its fullest sympathy with Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Iraq and Iran in their sad plight and hoped that all of them would emerge strong and free in a world, free from aggression and exploitation.<sup>238</sup> The Working Committee of the All India Ahrar Conference held at Lahore in August, 1942 reiterated its sympathy for the independence of the Islamic countries.<sup>239</sup> In his message to the Muslims of India on the occasion of Id-ul-Fitr in October, 1942, Jinnah stated, "while we are engaged in our struggle for freedom and independence let us not forget our brethren who in other parts of the world are doing likewise. Let us pray for their success. Let us also pray for these Muslim states who are independent and sovereign that God may help them to preserve and maintain their independence and sovereignty".<sup>240</sup>

No meeting of the Muslim League ever passed without paying attention to the Middle Eastern Countries with whom Muslims of India desired to cultivate friendly relations. The Council of the All India Muslim League in November, 1942 regretted that inspite of its proclamations that Britain was fighting for justice and right of all nations to be independent, she was trying to force Jewish domination over the Arabs against their will. The Council of Muslim League declared its solidarity with the Muslim brothers outside the country and urged upon the British Government to do justice to the Arabs in Palestine.<sup>241</sup> The annual session of the All India Muslim League held in Delhi in April 1943 viewed with grave concern the new Zionist propaganda in America which was pressurising the U.S. Government to remove all restrictions on Jewish immigration into Palestine and to adopt the policy of converting Palestine into a Jewish state. The League condemned the evil designs to perpetuate a wrong on the Arabs and demanded the fulfilment of Arab national demands for independence in Palestine and Syria and warned the British Government against any step which might prove detrimental to Arab national interests.<sup>242</sup> The Working Committee of the Muslim League in November, 1943 expressed alarm over the Jewish propagandist agencies exercising their influence in America and England for further immigration of Jews into Palestine which would be detrimental to the just and legitimate rights of that country. The Working Committee strongly warned the British Government that any further injustice done to Palestine Arabs under Jewish or foreign influence would be greatly resented by the Muslims of India.<sup>243</sup> Through another resolution the Council of the Muslim League demanded the abolition of the Mandate system and pleaded for restoration of Palestine, Syria and Lebanon to the people of those countries to set up their own sovereign governments. The Council of the Muslim League viewed with profound alarm the grave

situation that had arisen in Lebanon as a result of the action of the French authorities in forcibly suppressing the demand for full autonomy by the Lebanese and urged the British Government to secure full independence for Lebanon.<sup>244</sup>

Jinnah, who was the greatest defender of the Arabs in India, addressing the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation at Lahore on March 18, 1944 expressed sympathy with the Middle Eastern Countries.<sup>245</sup> In his presidential address to the Assam Provincial Muslim League Conference held in April, 1944, Chowdhary Khaliq-uz-Zaman told the British Government that any change in the policy envisaged in the White Paper of 1939 for Palestine would be followed with grave consequences in India.<sup>246</sup> The Gaya Pakistan Conference held in April, 1944 expressed concern at the situation in Palestine and requested the British Government to adhere to the pledges given to the Muslims of India.<sup>247</sup> The Azad Muslim Conference held in May, 1944 opposing the Pakistan demand of the Muslim League drew attention of the Muslims of India to the unbreakable bonds of faith and affection which united the Muslims of India to their Arab brethren in Palestine and warned the British Government that if it once again broke its promises given in the White Paper and surrendered to the financial pressure of the Jews and the dictates of America, it would unleash the boundless indignation and hostility not only of the Muslims of India but of the entire world.<sup>248</sup>

The interest of the Indian National Congress in the Middle Eastern Countries was so intense and deep rooted that only a few days after the release of all prominent Congress leaders from a long period of three years of imprisonment, the Congress Working Committee at its meeting at Bombay in June, 1945 noted with deep regret and resentment the attacks on Syrian and Lebanese independence by the French Government which were a violation not only of the specific pledges given to the Syrians and Lebanese but also a negation of the principles proclaimed by the United Nations.<sup>249</sup>

In fact, the whole of Nationalist India evinced a keen interest in the Middle Eastern Countries. Curiously enough, the Muslim League and the Congress, which held diametrically opposite views on internal problems in India, went on a parallel line in regard to Palestine. Of course, the Muslim League and other Muslim organisations viewed Palestine problem as a problem connected with their religion and faith. To the Congress, Palestine problem posed a problem of nationalist struggle against imperialism.

*India and Far East:* During the first three decades of the 20th century Indian National Movement had taken a deep interest in the affairs of the Far Eastern Countries and both China and Japan were her favourite nations. Whereas China had evoked India's interest as a similarly placed nation, Japan by her material, political and industrial progress had become a model before the nationalist leaders in India. But the developments in the Far East in 1930's reoriented India's policy towards China and Japan. Japan advanced her claims in Manchuria and seized it in 1931. The rape of Manchuria by Japan caused a widespread sympathy for China in India and Japan, which had so far been popular with Indians, began to be disliked<sup>250</sup> and from the very beginning of the Sino-Japanese hostilities the Indian Nationalists' sympathy was with the Chinese people. Japan's invasion of Manchuria, a Chinese province, worked a change in Indian nationalists' dreams of an

Asian unity to be organised under Japan's leadership against the pretensions of the Western peoples.<sup>251</sup>

Sympathy for China became so deep and profound in India that even the Indian delegates to the Assembly of the League of Nations could not fail to express their love for China. When China appealed to the League of Nations, B.L. Mitter, the Indian delegate to the twelfth session of League Assembly, said: "I would have taken a miss in my country had I allowed this occasion to pass in silence, for nowhere has China's calamity stirred deeper sympathy than in India. This is not merely due to the fact that China is our neighbour and a friendly neighbour; India and China are linked together by material ties of a common civilisation. We are stirred by the most personal feeling of sympathy."<sup>252</sup> Again in 1932 when the Japanese invasion of Manchuria was being discussed in the League Assembly, the Aga Khan, who headed the Indian delegation to the League Assembly, adopted a conciliatory method of approach to the problem and urged both China and Japan to settle their disputes in a peaceful manner and to seek the road to peace, reconciliation, adjustment and friendship and economic and intellectual co-operation in the permanent interests of both the nations. Claiming himself to be a delegate of the country which had a tradition of friendship with both China and Japan, the Aga Khan expressed his sympathy with China but avoided a forth-right censure of the Japanese aggression in China.<sup>253</sup>

Speaking from the presidential chair of the Indian National Congress held in 1936, Nehru expressed concern over the Japanese advance in China and assured the Chinese people of the sympathy of the Indian people in resisting the advancing imperialism of Japan.<sup>254</sup> Similar sentiments were expressed by other Indian leaders and the nationalist newspapers. Rabindranath Tagore's sympathy with China in her war against Japan was so profound that he disappointed Rash Bihari Bose who had requested him to stop the Indian National Congress and Nehru from adopting anti-Japanese attitude. Tagore could not conceal his anguish over the contents of the letters sent to him by Rash Bihari Bose, the great Indian revolutionary living in Tokyo, and told the latter that Japan had betrayed the cause of the East by her activities in China and hence it was not possible for him to keep the spontaneous and heartfelt sympathy of the Indians for China in check.<sup>255</sup>

Since the Manchurian crisis of 1931-32 China always remained under the peril of Japanese imperialism. On the night of July 7, 1937 the clash near Peiping between China and Japan precipitated a titanic struggle. At a time when China was faced with a foreign invasion, internal strife between the Kuomintang and the Communists plagued the life of the nation. Indians were anxious to see China divided in an hour of national calamity and they desired to see China united against Japan. To meet the Japanese aggression when the Communist Party and the Kuomintang Party reached a temporary settlement, M.N. Roy, a great Indian leader, viewed these developments with pleasure and declared that such a co-operation was the only way to the salvation of the Chinese nation and no one welcomed this belated change in the Communist Party of China more heartily than the Indians.<sup>256</sup>

Indian Press lent support to China against Japan. The *Hindustan Times* wrote that the Japanese Policy in China had so long been one of aggrandisement and to expect the Nanking Government to swallow a pill so bitter was to ask her to commit

suicide.<sup>257</sup> Criticising the Japanese policy in China the *Hindustan Times* stated that the protection of China was the responsibility of the League of Nations and therefore, the League of Nations must intervene to prevent Japan's outrage on China. "If it does not", the paper concluded, "the sooner the costly show at Geneva is wound up, the better will be for the preservation of honesty and security in international dealing".<sup>258</sup>

When the Government of India despatched Indian troops to Shanghai in 1937, the Indian National Congress protested against this policy. Bhulabhai Desai, S. Satyamurti and Sarat Chandra Bose, the three veteran Congress leaders, criticised the despatch of Indian troops to Shanghai to do the work of imperial policing.<sup>259</sup> On September 10, 1937, Nehru sent a cablegram to the International Peace Campaign Geneva in which he mentioned that the Indian National Congress was opposed to Japanese aggression in China and was also opposed to the despatch of Indian troops to China.<sup>260</sup> In a statement issued on September 14, 1937, he criticised the ruthless slaughter of thousands of human beings in China by Japan. He further stated that the League of Nations had become an impotent organisation in as much as that it could not dare even to discuss the Chinese issue. He urged the Indian people to organise their protest against Japanese policy in China and to observe September 26, 1937 as China Day to express India's solidarity with China and to condemn Japanese aggression and the despatch of Indian troops to China.<sup>261</sup>

India's solidarity with China was well illustrated on September 26, 1937 when China Day was observed throughout India. Meetings were held at Calcutta to express India's sympathy with China.<sup>262</sup> A mass meeting held at Bombay condemned Japanese aggression in China and the despatch of Indian troops to Shanghai and the attitude of the Great Powers and the League of Nations towards the Sino-Japanese hostilities and suggested the boycott of all Japanese goods.<sup>263</sup> Nearly one hundred Cyclists paraded the streets of Bombay carrying anti-Japan posters and demonstrated before the Japanese Consulate.<sup>264</sup> The *Hindustan Times* dated October 7, 1937 pleaded for all round boycott of the Japanese goods.<sup>265</sup> Subhash Chandra Bose also remarked : "With all our admiration for Japan where such admiration is due, our whole heart goes to China in her hour of trial. China must still live for her own sake and for humanity."<sup>266</sup>

Indians living in London could not remain unaffected by the wave of sympathy for China in India caused by Japanese invasion of China. To express solidarity with China they formed China-India Committee in London. Uday Shankar, an Indian artist, and his associates performed charity show of their art to collect money to help the Chinese in distress. Nehru congratulated Uday Shankar for this noble task and declared, "The claim of common humanity, the bond that had tied us for thousands of years, as well as self-interest impel us to show our full solidarity with the people of China in this hour of their agony...We are weak today and unable to do much for the people of China but hearts are with them, and it is well that we should do our utmost to help them".<sup>267</sup>

The Patna District Kisan Conference held at Bikram on October 25, 1937 expressed sympathy with the Chinese Government and condemned the horrible activities of Japan in China.<sup>268</sup> The All India Congress Committee viewed with grave concern the imperialist aggression of Japan in China attended with wanton cruelty

and the bombing of the civil population and applauded the brave and heroic struggle of the Chinese people and congratulated them on achieving internal unity in the face of national danger. The Congress Committee offered its heart-felt sympathy to the Chinese people and assured them of the solidarity of the Indian people with them in their struggle for maintaining their freedom. The Congress Committee urged upon the people of India to refrain from the use of Japanese goods as a mark of their sympathy with the people of China.<sup>269</sup> The Allahabad District Political Conference held in December, 1937 condemned the Japanese aggression in China and requested the people to boycott Japanese goods.<sup>270</sup>

Convinced of the sincere love and sympathy of India for the Chinese people, some of the Chinese leaders appealed to the Indian people for moral and material support against the Japanese. On October 4, 1937 V.K. Wellington Koo, China's representative on the Council and first delegate to the Assembly of the League of Nations, appealed to the Indians for their support to the Chinese nation in the inhuman war imposed by Japan on China.<sup>271</sup> On November 23, 1937, Agnes Smedley in a letter to Nehru appealed to the Indian National Congress to render monetary help to the Chinese people to enable them to continue their fight against Japan.<sup>272</sup> Chu Teh, Commander-in-Chief of the Eighth Route Army of China, wrote a letter to Nehru on November 26, 1937 and requested him to give financial assistance to China. "We ask you to consider this question in all seriousness", Chu Teh wrote, "to intensify your campaign to help us, to broaden and deepen your movement for the boycott of Japanese goods and to educate your people about the facts of our war of liberation."<sup>273</sup>

These various appeals of the Chinese leaders had their favourable reaction in India which intensified her attempts to help China. The All India Trade Union Congress in January 1938 sent its greetings to the Chinese people and expressed its solidarity with the workers, peasants and citizens of China in their struggle against Japanese aggression. It urged upon the people of India to boycott Japanese goods and requested the people to contribute to the funds started for sending medical supplies and other aid to the Chinese army.<sup>274</sup> The Assam Mahila Conference held at Gauhati on January 4, 1938 condemned the brutal and horrible atrocities committed by Japanese Imperialism upon the innocent people of China and expressed its full sympathy with the people of China in their heroic struggle. It requested the people of Assam to boycott Japanese goods.<sup>275</sup>

It was in response to the various appeals of the Chinese leaders for help and assistance that second China Day was observed on January 9, 1938 throughout India. The Students' League, Central Calcutta District Committee, Port Trust Employees Association, North Calcutta District Congress Committee, 21 ward Congress Committee, Bura Bazar Congress Committee and Self Help Club organised meetings in support of China in all parts of Calcutta, condemned Japanese aggression in China and appealed to the people of India to boycott Japanese goods as a mark of practical sympathy with China.<sup>276</sup> Speaking at Allahabad on the occasion of the China Day on January 9, 1938. Nehru asked Indians to help China by boycotting Japanese goods and by sending financial help to sufferers in China.<sup>277</sup> Rabindranath Tagore also appealed to the people of India to assist China and he himself contributed five hundred rupees to the China Relief Fund started by the Congress.<sup>278</sup>

Meetings were held in Tamilnadu and Nagpur to express sympathy with China and to condemn Japan's growing imperialism.<sup>279</sup>

The Bengal Provincial Conference held on January 30, 1938 resolved to boycott Japanese goods.<sup>280</sup> The annual session of the Indian National Congress held at Haripura in February, 1938 reiterated its concern over the brutal invasion of China and its previous calls upon the people of India to refrain from purchasing Japanese goods.<sup>281</sup> The All India Socialist Conference at its fourth session held at Lahore in April 1938 sent greetings to the Nationalist Government of China for its brave fight for defending freedom and democracy.<sup>282</sup> The Hindu in its editorial under the Caption "Fit to Print" condemned Japanese atrocities in China and sympathised with the Chinese who were defending their country from the attacks of Japan. Disapproving the Japanese slogan of Asia for the Asiatics it wrote that Japan had gone further than the fascist countries and was trying to persuade her enemies that she was killing them for their own goods.<sup>283</sup>

Indian's sympathy for China became so widespread that June 12, 1938 was observed as China Day to mark India's solidarity with China in her hour of trial and distress. Meetings were held throughout the country, resolutions were passed and sympathy was expressed for China. Demonstrations were held in urban and rural areas all over the country and money was collected for relief work in China. At these meetings, the Chinese national flag was unfurled together with the flag of the Indian National Congress as a symbol of solidarity.<sup>284</sup> The speeches delivered on the occasion expressed more the sorrow than the anger that China should be the victim of aggression by a nation that was by tradition and history closely associated to her. The meetings repudiated Japan's fellowship with modern imperialism.<sup>285</sup>

In response to the Congress President's appeal, China Day was observed at Calcutta on July 7, 1938. This meeting of the citizens of Calcutta viewed with grave concern the continued fascist aggression of imperialist Japan upon China and strongly condemned the methods of horror and frightfulness pursued by Japan in China.<sup>286</sup> Municipal Corporations of Calcutta and Madras, in July, 1938, raised their protests under the instructions of the Congress and the Congress President against the Japanese bombardment of the open town of Canton. The Madras Corporation, moved by the Japanese inhuman activities in China, also decided to declare a boycott of Japanese goods for five years.<sup>287</sup>

Jawahar Lal Nehru excelled all the nationalist leaders in his love for China. In his speech at the Conference on Peace and Empire organised by India League and London Federation of Peace Councils, on July 15 and 16, 1938, Nehru declared that the invasion of Japan on China had brought India and China nearer to one another.<sup>288</sup> As a representative of the Indian National Congress at the Conference organised by International Peace Campaign on the *Bombardment of Open Towns and the Restoration of Peace* held in Paris on July 23 and 24, 1938, Nehru declared that each day's news of bombing in China stabs me and makes me sick with the horror of it.<sup>289</sup> He assured China of India's full moral support in her task of defending her freedom.<sup>290</sup> On November 17, 1938, he urged the people of India not to be indifferent to the happenings in China.<sup>291</sup> In his letter to the Manchester Guardian, he disapproved of Japan's policy in China.<sup>292</sup>

Japan ran a low estimation in Indian public and admiration for Japan reached

the lowest ebb during the Sino-Japanese hostilities and a sharp decline in Indo-Japanese trade was caused by India's resolve to boycott the Japanese goods.<sup>293</sup> The anti-Japanese and pro-Chinese attitude prevalent in India was manifested in the letters that passed on between Tagore and Japanese poet, Noguchi in 1938. In his first letter to Tagore, Noguchi explained that the war in China was not the criminal outcome of Japan's surrender to the West rather it was the inevitable means terrible thought it was, for establishing a new order in the Asiatic continent. "Believe me," Noguchi wrote to Tagore, "it is the War of Asia for Asia. The War is not for conquest, but for the correction of the mistaken idea of China".<sup>294</sup> Tagore in his reply to Noguchi disapproved of Japanese policy in China and gave a carp-ing reply to Noguchi and said : "You are building your conception of an Asia which would be raised on a tower of skulls."<sup>295</sup> Condemning large scale killing and blood-shed lanuched by Japan in China, Tagore declared that Noguchi's doctrine of "*Asia for Asia*" was "an instrument of political blackmail".<sup>296</sup> In a letter to his Japanese friend, Tagore expressed his willingness to visit Japan to carry out his own mission to do his best to establish a civilised relationship of national amity between the two great peoples of Asia, namely the Chinese and the Japanese, who were engaged in a disolating mutual destruction. Expressing his doubts that the military au-thorities of Japan, who seemed to be determined to crush China, would allow him the freedom to take his own course. Tagore wrote, "You know I have a genuine love for the Japanese people and it is sure to hurt me too painfully to go and watch crowds of them being transported by their rulers to a neighbouring land to perpet-rate acts of inhumanity which will brand their name with a lasting stain in the his-tory of Man".<sup>297</sup>

Gandhiji did not lag behind any other leader in his sympathy with China. When Prof. Tao visited him, Gandhiji struck by China's suffering, said movingly, "I do want to see peace reigning in your land during my life"<sup>298</sup> and nothing would give him greater pleasure than to visit China one day.<sup>299</sup>

India's solidarity with China became more pronounced on September 1, 1938 when a Medical Mission consisting of five doctors under the leadership of Dr. M. Atal left India for China.<sup>300</sup> Commenting upon the despatch of the Indian Medical Mission to China, Subhas Chandra Bose, the Congress President stated that the Medical Mission symbolised India's goodwill, esteem and sympathy for the Chinese nation.<sup>301</sup> The thirty-first session of the U.P. Political Conference held in December, 1938 sent its greetings to the people of China and its deepest sympathy in their trials and privations in the struggle for freedom against a ruthless and inhuman imperialism. Welcoming the despatch of a Congress Medical Mission to China on behalf of the Indian people the Conference hoped that this Mission would continue to receive full financial support so that it might carry on its work of relief effecti-vely and be a worthy symbol of Indian solidarity with China.<sup>302</sup> The Indian National Congress held at Tripuri in March, 1939 sent its greetings to the people of China and congratulated them on their heroic resistance of the Japanese invaders.<sup>303</sup>

Pro-Chinese feelings did not remain confined to India alone. It had its impact on the Indians living outside the country. This was revealed when the Chinese workers refused to help in producing munitions for Japan in Malaya in the Japa-nese owned tin and iron mines, and left the mines and thereupon Indian workers

were engaged. But at the request of the Indian National Congress, the Indian workers also refused to work there, although this meant suffering to them.<sup>304</sup> To express their resentment against the failure of the League of Nations to prevent Japanese imperialist advance in China, a Congress member moved a resolution in the Central Legislative Assembly on April 15, 1939 calling for India's withdrawal from the League of Nations.<sup>305</sup>

India's spontaneous and heartfelt sympathy and solidarity with China culminated in Nehru's visit to China in August, 1939. His visit to China was the greatest single factor which more than all other friendly gestures had contributed to the growing solidarity between India and China in the pre-Second World War period. With the blessings of Mahatma Gandhi and Tagore, Nehru went to China to convey the affection and sympathy of the people of India to the Chinese people and bring back something of the courage and invincible optimism of the Chinese people and their capacity to pull together when peril confronts them.<sup>306</sup> Rabindranath Tagore felt pride that the new spirit of Asia would be represented through Nehru and best traditions of Indian humanity would find their voice during his contacts with the people of China.<sup>307</sup> Rajendra Prasad, the Congress President for the year 1939, welcomed Nehru's visit to China and said that Nehru was India's unofficial ambassador to carry her greetings to the sister nation, and her best wishes for China's success in the heroic struggle.<sup>308</sup> Though he went to China in his personal capacity, the visit had behind it, the goodwill of the whole country and the Congress.

Nehru was warmly received in China by all sections of people including Generalissimo Chiang Kai Shek and Madame Chiang Kai Shek. Few Foreign visitors to China's war time capital of Chungking, wrote S.T. Hsieh, a contemporary Chinese, had received such a welcome as that showered on Pt. Nehru. Several hours before his arrival, six hundred representatives from one hundred and ninety three Chinese public bodies turned out at the aerodrome under the blazing sun to welcome him.<sup>309</sup> He met practically all the prominent leaders of China including General Yeh Chien-Ying of the Eighth Route Army of the Communists.<sup>310</sup> He wanted to go to the North-West of China with a view to see the working of the Indian Medical Mission but as a consequence of the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe he had to cut short his tour and return to India.

During his short stay in China, Nehru in public speeches and statements, press interviews and a special broadcast arranged for him at Chungking demonstrated deep love and solidarity with the Chinese people. He conveyed to the Chinese people and leaders India's admiration for the heroic struggle against the Japanese invaders. On all occasions he reminded the people of China of the long historical tradition of friendship that united China and India expressed the hope that though they were passing through shabby treatment at the hands of the imperialists they would definitely come out of muddy water in which they had been thrown by the imperialists and a bright future was in store for them.<sup>311</sup> In an interview in Chungking Nehru pointed out that China and India were the nations of yesterday with thousands of years of culture behind them but what was more significant was that they are also nations of tomorrow, for they are preparing with the co-operation of all the freedom loving people to establish a new World Order. A bright future awaits our two peoples.<sup>312</sup>

Expressing his sympathy with the Chinese people with whom was felt a certain community of suffering,<sup>313</sup> Nehru strongly condemned Japanese imperialist grips over China and observed : "we have no ill-will against Japan, we harbour no ill-will even today against her people. But the policy which Japan has pursued in China is a policy which we detest. For long years past we have struggled for our own freedom against a powerful imperialism, and we have become convinced that there can be no true freedom till imperialism, Fascism and the aggressions that further them are rooted out of the world".<sup>314</sup> In his address to the Chinese people which was broadcasted from Chungking radio on August 30, 1939 Nehru emphasised the need, desirability and importance of the Sino-Indian Co-operation for the sake of the freedom of our dearly-loved countries, for Asia and the World.<sup>315</sup> Speaking on another occasion, Nehru declared that China and India had a message to the World and in this great task of delivering a message to the whole World China and India had to co-operate for their own good as well as for the good of the World. He further pointed out that the future world order would lose its significance unless it postulated the co-operation of a free China and a free India.<sup>316</sup>

Nehru was not satisfied with the composition and the working of the Kuomintang party of China which was not a very democratic body.<sup>317</sup> But his foggiest notion of the Kuomintang did not deter him from having a very high estimate of Chiang Kai Shek and Madame Chiang Kai Shek on whom he made several calls. Paying tributes to Chiang Kai Shek, Nehru called him the "helmsman of China's boat of destiny, symbol of her unity and of her unconquerable determination to resist aggression and to free herself".<sup>318</sup>

Nehru's visit lasted for merely a few days nevertheless he returned from China with a love for the country "excelled", to quote Mahatma Gandhi, if at all by his love of his own country.<sup>319</sup> He was himself overwhelmed by abundant goodwill and hospitality he met with everywhere in China and he noted in the Chinese people a deep urge for friendship with the Indians.<sup>320</sup> Nehru's desire to see India and China united in close ties was fully reciprocated by the Chinese leaders. All the time in China, Nehru wrote, he and his Chinese friends talked of the past and thought of the bright promise of their future co-operation.<sup>321</sup> Summing up the results of his visit to China he wrote in his Autobiography : "I returned to India as an even greater admirer of China and the Chinese people than I had been previously and I could not imagine that any adverse fate could break the spirit of these ancient peoples."<sup>322</sup>

Nehru's visit awakened a similar enthusiasm in the Chinese mind and gave tremendous moral support to the Chinese people in their armed resistance against Japanese territorial invasion.<sup>323</sup> Evaluating the impact of Nehru's visit on Sino-Indian relations, the "North China Star", an English daily of China, declared that Nehru's visit, just before the war, to China to see Generalissimo Chiang Kai Shek and their long conversations in the limestone tunnels of Chungking had developed a deeper understanding between these two men, who were the outstanding leaders of Asia, and who both combined nationalist enthusiasm with a strong passion for real international understanding.<sup>324</sup> Nehru's visit brought the two countries closer to each other and Indian nationalists began to anxiously watch the British policy in the Far East and warned the British Government that if it continued the policy of

appeasement towards Japan at the cost of China "India would react strongly."<sup>325</sup>

India's sympathy with China expressed by Nehru during his stay in China convinced the Chinese leaders of India's support in hours of trouble. Madam Sunyat Sen expressed her intention to establish a branch of China Defence League in India and sympathised with the Indian struggle for freedom which, she added, was also the cause of China.<sup>326</sup> Appreciating Nehru's visit to China and its influence on Sino-Indian collaboration Chu Chia Hua of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang in a letter to Nehru outlined the measures the Chinese were going to take for the promotion of Sino-Indian collaboration—an objective which was highly stressed by Nehru during his visit to China and the measures included the exchange of professors, students, visiting or tourist groups or of experts.<sup>327</sup>

Leaders of Nationalist India wished the Chinese nation a success in the Sino-Japanese hostilities and anything which could have an adverse effect was highly resented. When the British Government closed the Burma Road which was the outlet for China to receive foreign assistance, Indian nationalists smelt a rat behind this policy. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the president of the Indian National Congress for the year 1940, in a statement declared that the decision of the British Government to close the Burma-China Road was a matter which had serious significance for China, India, Burma and Britain because this road had been built at enormous sacrifice by China and was one of the main arteries of traffic between China and the outer World. The road had brought China and Burma and India nearer to one another and their contacts had been developed by this road. He further declared that the people of India had received with grave concern the closure of the Burma Road which was a severe assault on the growing contacts and a flouting of Indian opinion which was essentially pro-Chinese. This move of the British Government was in complete conflict with the foreign policy which the Indian people sought to practice. It did not only violate the international usage and the Sino-British treaties rather it was evidently meant to hamper China in her struggle for freedom. "We must therefore," concluded the Congress President, "wholly disapprove of the action of the British Government in closing the Burma-China Road".<sup>328</sup> In his article published in April, 1940, Nehru regarded the Sino-Japanese war in the Far East as a tragic event and declared that there could be no stable order or effective co-operation in the world if China and India were ignored.<sup>329</sup>

The National Liberal Federation in December, 1940 appreciated China's heroic resistance against Japanese aggression and expressed the hope that China would come out with flying colours in the trial of her patience.<sup>330</sup>

India's unbounded sympathy for China evoked a similar response in China which also expressed its sympathy with Indian struggle for freedom. Expressing their appreciation of the moral support the Indian National Congress had given to China, Mao Tse Tung and Chu Teh, on behalf of the Eighth Route Army, declared, "The great Indian people and the Chinese have a common destiny. We, the Indian people and the Chinese combined, compose almost half of mankind. We are the two peoples who have been suffering longest imperial oppression and slavery, and we both have the glorious tradition of fighting for liberty and freedom. Our emancipation, the emancipation of the Indian people and the Chinese, will be the signal

of the emancipation of all the down-trodden and oppressed.”<sup>331</sup> Cheng Yin-Fun, Executive Secretary of the China Branch of International Peace Campaign, Chungking, in his letters to Nehru appreciated the latter’s unfailing sympathy and support for China and pointed out that the whole of China had great sympathy for the Indian people and the developments in India had always been followed with much interest in China.

Referring to the past close cultural contacts between India and China, the Chinese leader enthusiastically observed, “Our mutual undertaking for national liberation, will bring even closer the existing ties of friendship. We are earnestly looking forward to the day when the Indians and the Chinese can work hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder for the peace of the world.”<sup>332</sup> Madame Chiang Kai Shek in her letter dated September 10, 1940 expressed the anxiety and interest with which she and Chiang Kai Shek had been watching the developments in India and sent greetings to Indian people.<sup>333</sup> Chinese sympathy for India became more pronounced when all the top leaders of the Congress were remanded to Jails on October 17, 1940 for having started a Civil Disobedience Movement at the call of Mahatma Gandhi against the exploitation of Indian resources for fighting the war which the Indians considered as an imperialist war. Madame Chiang Kai Shek expressing her concern over the arrest of Nehru declared that “it was beyond description to narrate the tremendous wave of agitation, your imprisonment has brought about amongst my own people. So many who had so pinned their hopes in British democracy are asking themselves whether they had mistaken imperialism for liberalism”.<sup>334</sup> It was also amazing that while the Japanese invasion was in progress and the Chinese people were awfully busy in defending their country, the Nationalist Government of China sent two missions to India to promote cultural links between the two countries. One delegation was led by Tai Chi Tao and other was headed by Dr. Koo, a member of the Chinese Ministry of Education. Mr. Tai presented to the Indian National Congress the following message from Chiang Kai Shek, “May the Indian and Chinese people, entertain mutual affection, mutual understanding, and mutual respect that will last to eternity”.<sup>335</sup> All this showed plainly what value Chiang Kai Shek and other Chinese leaders attached to friendly relations with India then a non-entity politically.

Even during the period of the British attempt to overpower the nationalist leaders by putting them into Jail custody, Indian people viewed with concern the war going on in the Far East. *The Hindu* dated July 8, 1941 asked the Western democracies to back China because it was China that had helped to maintain the balance of power in the Far East.<sup>336</sup> Mrs. Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya in her article entitled “My visit to Nanking” expressed her disapproval of the Japanese war methods in China and movingly remarked, “No foreign power ever held a conquered country so unrealistically as Japan holds China today”.<sup>337</sup> Indian public opinion saw danger inherent in the civil war going on in China and therefore urged upon the Chinese people to forge a common front against imperialist Japan forgetting their internal differences. *The Hindu* dated the January 21, 1941 cautioned the Chinese against the internal dissensions and wrote that “nothing would serve Japan’s interest than a split in the Chinese United Front”.<sup>338</sup> Writing on another occasion the above daily declared that unless the internal situation changed China

would be engaged simultaneously at two fronts—the home front and border front. To save China from being swept away by the civil war, it was essential that the United States, Britain and the U.S.S.R. should agree to respect the territorial integrity of China and try to create mutual understanding between the Communists and the Nationalists in China. It further warned the Chinese leaders that if the internal conflict in China was not ended soon, “it may lead to tragic ends on China’s epic struggle for freedom”.<sup>339</sup>

After Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour on December 7, 1941 the World War assumed a new dimension. The British Government in India released all the Congress leaders from confinement. Nehru in a statement lauded the struggle of the Chinese people.<sup>340</sup> The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress held at Bardoli in December, 1941 sent its greetings to the Chinese people and congratulated them on their patience and admired their courage in having set up an example of unparalleled heroism.<sup>341</sup> Addressing the Congress meeting at Wardha in January, 1942, Mahatma Gandhi stated that the Indians and the Chinese were faced with a similar catastrophe and expressed India’s solidarity with China.<sup>342</sup>

In the history of Sino-Indian relations in the pre-independence era, the visit to India by Chiang Kai Shek and Madame Chiang Kai Shek was a milestone. On the insistence of Roosevelt,<sup>343</sup> Chiang Kai Shek along with Madame Chiang made a trip to India in February, 1942 when nationalist leaders were making ceaseless efforts to get freedom and to non-co-operate with the British Government unless the aim was fulfilled. At that time the war situation had changed and the balance leaned in favour of Japan in the Far East. The object of Chiang’s visit was to have a personal exchange of views with the members of the Government in India and with prominent men in India’s public life, in order to secure more effective united efforts against aggression.<sup>344</sup> The *Statesman* thus described the purpose of this visit, “To know where India stands, how solid she is in support and, if not solid, how she can become so, what potentiality and resources she can be counted on to develop and contribute, what is the country’s morale—all these information is vital for China”.<sup>345</sup> The visit took place with the object to induce the Indian leaders to co-operate with the British Government which in the war was the ally of China for which Indians felt spontaneous love and admiration.

The two distinguished leaders of China received warm ovation all over the country and visited various places in India and met all those who mattered in the circle of nationalist leaders. Welcoming the Chinese leaders, Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit, the president of the All India Women’s Conference, expressed the hope that this visit would go a long way in reviving the past close friendly links between India and China. In her reply to the welcome address Madame Chiang also stressed the close friendly contacts between India and China and advised the Indians not to be enticed away by the Japanese slogan that they were coming to liberate the Indians and urged the Indians to take lessons from the Japanese atrocities in Burma and China.<sup>346</sup> Talking to pressmen Madame Chiang declared that she was highly impressed by India. She further hoped that her visit had intensified the spiritual unity between India and China.<sup>347</sup>

Chiang Kai Shek wanted to see Gandhiji at Wardha but Churchill turned down this request as the cabinet did not agree to it.<sup>348</sup> Despite this official displeasure

private meeting did take place between Chiang Kai Shek and Mahatma Gandhi in Calcutta on February 18, 1942<sup>319</sup> and both the leaders talked for four and a half hours.<sup>350</sup>

During their stay in India Chiang Kai Shek and Madame Chiang were given warm ovation by the Indians belonging to various fields of national life. Needless to say that the British Government wanted to capitalise on India's natural sympathy for China and therefore it arranged for the Chinese leaders' visit to India. Nevertheless, both the dignitaries were treated with the utmost friendliness and courtesy and all the political organisations welcomed Chiang's visit. The All India Nationalist League at its meeting in New Delhi on February 26, 1942 characterised the visit as "heralding a new link between India and China which are already connected by ties of culture and civilisation from ancient times".<sup>351</sup> It also assured the Chinese people of India's whole hearted support in their heroic resistance to the imperialist greed of Japan and wished China a success in the struggle.<sup>352</sup> Addressing a public meeting at Calcutta, Nehru appealed to the people of India to take inspiration from China and to face bravely Japan which represented the worst forms of imperialism.<sup>353</sup> The All Parties Leaders' Conference held in February, 1942 appreciated the Chiang's visit for having established cordial relations between India and China.<sup>354</sup> M.R. Jayakar and Tej Bahadur Supru welcomed the visit and expressed their solidarity with China.<sup>355</sup>

Convinced of India's sympathy with China, Chiang Kai Shek in his farewell address to the people of India, Championed the cause of Indian freedom and frankly stated, "I sincerely hope and confidently believe, that our ally, Great Britain, without waiting for any demands on the part of the people of India, will as speedily as possible, give them real political power so that they may be in a position to develop their spiritual and material strength and thus realise that their participation in the war is not merely an aid to the anti-aggression nations for securing victory, but also a turning point in their struggle for India's struggle".<sup>356</sup> He further reminded his brethren, the people of India of the historic friendship between India and China and declared that "at this most critical moment in the history of civilisation our two peoples should exert themselves to the utmost in the cause of freedom for all mankind, for only in a free world could the Chinese and the Indian people obtain the freedom. Furthermore, should freedom be denied to either China or India there could be no real peace in the World".<sup>357</sup>

Chiang Kai Shek tried to persuade the British authorities to concede the demands of the Indian National Congress, one of which, as then put forward, was the recognition of India's sovereign status and the formation of an Indian National Government. The War Cabinet, however, frowned on such an intervention. Churchill wrote a letter to Chiang Kai Shek expressing the hope that the latter would be so kind as not to press the matter contrary to the wishes of the Viceroy or the King-Emperor.<sup>358</sup> The British Government did not want that Chiang Kai Shek should openly champion the cause of Indian freedom and therefore disapproved of Chiang's policy towards India.

Though the Chiang's visit could not solve the Indian deadlock and did not convince the British authorities of the urgency of Indian freedom, yet the visit of the Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai Shek to India, and the manner in which

the Indian people welcomed them, have spun new threads of fellowship for ninety crores of human beings, counting almost half the population of the world. India and China might not have gained the immediate object desired by both of them. But the events of February, 1942 will stand as a landmark in the history of the two countries, and will influence World history and its future evolution.<sup>359</sup> The true significance of the Chiang's visit to India was rightly stressed by Nehru in the following words : "The bonds that tied India and China grew stronger, and so did the desire to line up with China and other nations against the common adversary."<sup>360</sup>

India's immense sympathy for China aroused by Chiang's visit to India was manifested on March 7, 1942, the day on which China Day was observed with due solemnity and enthusiasm all over Calcutta and suburbs. The celebration of China Day was not confined to Bengal alone rather in every part of India, the people organised meetings, speechified on the occasion and reassured the Chinese of the Indian solidarity in the fight against imperialism.<sup>361</sup>

Rapid advance made by the Japanese troops in South East Asia and the surrender of Singapore and Rangoon to the Japanese on February, 15 and March 7, 1942 respectively exposed India to Japanese aggression which disturbed the Indian nationalists who held the presence of the British in India an invitation to the Japanese aggression and began to demand for early British withdrawal from India and to criticise Japan for her militarist and imperialist policies. Addressing a public meeting at Calcutta on February 20, 1942, Nehru appealed to the people of India to face bravely any aggressor whether it was Germany or Japan.<sup>362</sup> Swami Sahajananda Sarswati, President of the All India Kisan Sabha, urged the Indians to gird their loins to meet Japanese aggression.<sup>363</sup> Rajendra Prasad in a statement on May 1, 1942 declared that Indians desired to end British imperialist domination but they did not wish to invite Japan and install her as their overlord to oust Britain.<sup>364</sup> In course of a speech at a public meeting at Monghyr in Bihar, Rajendra Prasad repudiated Japanese claim to liberate India and said that God should save Indians from such friends because the fate of Korea and Manchuria at the hands of Japan was a beacon light of Japanese goodwill.<sup>365</sup> Speaking at a public meeting at Ajmer on November 23, 1942, B.S. Moonje told the Indian people that if any one believed that India could secure freedom as a result of Japanese invasion, he lived in a fool's paradise.<sup>366</sup> In a statement Nehru declared, "I consider it my duty to oppose any foreign invasion of India. The news of Japanese bombing of the coastal areas of India must stir the heart of every Indian. The Japanese assertion that they are coming to India to set us free is absurd and totally false".<sup>367</sup> On July 7, 1942 Rajagopalachari addressing a public meeting in Madras appealed to the people of India to shoulder the task of defending the country from the Japanese.<sup>368</sup>

Keeping in view the imminent danger of Japanese aggression, Indian leaders began to ask the British to withdraw from India. Gandhi stressed the point that the mere presence of Britain in India was the cause of the imminent danger of the Japanese attack on India. Hence, for the safety of India, Gandhi desired that the British should withdraw from India.<sup>369</sup> However, Indian leaders did not forget the Chinese interests. Writing in *The Harijan*, Gandhi reaffirmed his strong friendship for China and declared that he was not indifferent to China while formulating his

demand for British withdrawal from India. The only effective way to help China was to free India so that she could whole-heartedly support the war efforts. When asked whether his attitude would not harm the cause of China with which he professed friendship, Gandhi emphatically stated, "I remain the passionate friend of China that I have always claimed to be. I know what loss of freedom means. Therefore I could not but be in sympathy with China which is my next door neighbour in distress. And, if I believed in violence and if I could influence India, I would put in motion every force at my command on behalf of China to save her liberty".<sup>370</sup> In a letter to Chiang Kai Shek, Gandhi explained the reasons behind his demand for British withdrawal and gave assurances of Indian's sympathy to the Chinese people. Declaring his profound love for the Chinese people and his earnest desire to see China and India united for their mutual advantage. Gandhi informed the Chinese people that his demand for British withdrawal was not meant for weakening India's defence against the Japanese or embarrassing the Chinese in their struggle. He would not purchase India's freedom at the cost of China's freedom and desired India to play her rightful part in preventing the Japanese domination. Appreciating the heroic Chinese resistance against the Japanese invaders Gandhi assured the Chinese leader that whatever action he might recommend to the Indian people would be governed by the consideration that it should not injure China or encourage Japanese aggression in China.<sup>371</sup> Gandhi's entire attitude towards China was summed up in the remark, "India, free and independent, will play a prominent part in defending China. India lying at the feet of Great Britain may mean China lying at the feet of Japan".<sup>372</sup>

Gandhi's demand for British withdrawal from India was highly misunderstood. Rumours persisted about Gandhi's sympathy towards Japan. The *London Times* dated June 21, 1942 wrote that those who sought the freedom of India knew in their heart that Gandhi's policy meant no freedom but enslavement to Japan.<sup>373</sup> But Gandhi was not pro-Japanese. In an interview to Louis Fischer in the month of June 1942 Gandhi agreed to the stationing of the troops of the United Nations in a free India for he did not wish Japan or other Axis powers to win.<sup>374</sup> The Congress Working Committee in July, 1942 gave approval to Gandhi's demand for the British withdrawal from India as a pre-condition to India's support to the War efforts of the Allies. As India had no desire to embarrass Britain or other Allied powers in their prosecution of the war or to encourage a Japanese invasion of India or further pressure on China, the Congress Committee agreed to the stationing of the armed forces of the Allied Powers in India in order to ward off and resist the Japanese aggression.<sup>375</sup>

Gandhi made his attitude known towards the Far East in his open letter "To Every Japanese" written on July 18, 1942. He described the Japanese attack on China as indefensible and criticised Japan's efforts to dismember Asia and to prevent a World Federation. Giving a strong warning to the Japanese for their imperialistic adventures Gandhi however admitted that he had no ill feeling against Japan and said that if he was allowed by Japanese to go to Japan he would risk even his life to plead with them to desist from the wrong that they were doing to China. He further warned Tokyo not to exploit the situation to invade India because the Japanese would be sadly disillusioned if they believed that they would receive a

willing welcome from India. Indians would not fail in resisting the Japanese with all the might that their country could muster.<sup>376</sup> Gandhi clearly repudiated the allegation that he was pro-Japanese and said, "I would rather like to be shot than to submit to Japanese or any other power".<sup>377</sup>

The All India Congress Committee, which passed the Quit India Resolution in August, 1942, also expressed disapproval of Japan's policy and lent support to China. Sardar Patel warned his audience against putting any faith in the professions of Japan about their good intentions regarding India. Speaking on the occasion Gandhiji stated that the coming of Japan would mean the end of China, and perhaps of Russia too and declared that he would not wish to be the instrument of Russia's defeat or of China. If that happened, he said, he would hate himself.<sup>378</sup> In a message to the Chinese people Gandhiji declared: "Let China know that the struggle is as much for her defence as it is for India's liberation, for, in that liberation is involved her ability to give effective assistance whether to China or to Russia or even to Great Britain or America."<sup>379</sup>

The Congress Committee in August, 1942 viewed with concern the deterioration in the situation on the Chinese fronts and lauded the heroic resistance of the Chinese people against the mounting imperialism of Japan. India's demand for British withdrawal, the Committee further declared, was to enable India to meet the then perilous situation to defend herself and help Russia and China in their hour of distress and need.<sup>380</sup> Nehru sent a message to China, assuring the latter that India would always be on the side of China in her hours of distress because with China unfree Indian freedom would be endangered and worth little purchase. He further declared, "Whatever we do now, constrained by circumstances, is aimed at the achievement of India's independence so that we may fight with all our strength and will against the aggressor in India and China".<sup>381</sup>

The Quit India movement caused a grave concern in the official circle and the Government took all steps to suppress the movement including the arrest of all prominent Congress leaders. The news of the arrest of the Congress leaders shocked the Chinese people and the Chinese Government reacted unfavourably to the arrest of Gandhiji and other Congress leaders. Dr. T.F. Tsiang, a Minister in the Chinese Government, said, "Nationalism is a Psychological phenomenon which can not be reckoned in terms of calculations and moreover, could not be suppressed with guns or by imprisonment".<sup>382</sup> Even before the Quit India Movement Chiang Kai Shek had cabled American President Roosevelt on July 25, 1942 counselling the latter that the wisest and most enlightened policy for Britain to pursue would be to restore India her complete freedom.<sup>383</sup> But Winston Churchill threatened to withdraw from the Sino-British treaty alliance if China continued to interfere in Indian affairs.<sup>384</sup> Thereupon Chiang Kai Shek kept silence on the Indian question.

After the Quit India movement, the Chinese newspapers carried headlined articles on the Indian political situation deploring the aggravation of the tension. **The Official Central Daily News** wrote, "We receive news of the arrest of Mr. Gandhi, Pandit Nehru and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad with regret".<sup>385</sup> The Chinese Press comments on the Indian movement were very sympathetic and boldly criticised the British Government for the arrests and declared that Indian emergency was also their emergency.<sup>386</sup> **The Ta Kung Pao**, the influential independent news-

paper which was most vehement in the denunciation of the British policy in India,<sup>387</sup> wrote in its editorial, "The news of Mahatma Gandhi's arrest and of the disturbances and blood-shed in India has been received here with great sorrow".<sup>388</sup> The *Ta Kung Pao* further observed that India's struggle for freedom was identical with the war aims of the United Nations and the Chinese had no reason not to be sympathetic to the Indian cause.<sup>389</sup> Dr. Sun Fo, President of the Legislative Yuan, regretted the arrest of the Indian leaders and declared that the Chinese sympathy was entirely with Indians in the struggle for independence.<sup>390</sup> On August 12, 1942, Tsiang Fe, the Director of the Chinese Political Department, stated that the Chinese Government was a friend and ally of Britain, while the Chinese people had the warmest friendship for the Indian people. He further urged the British Government to find out a solution for India.<sup>391</sup> These statements of the Chinese leaders demonstrated the growing solidarity between India and China.

India's sympathy for China continued even during those days when the Congress leadership was in Jail and the country was in constant danger of Japanese invasion. Seeing the rapid Japanese advance in China *The Hindu* urged for the despatch of more planes to China because the future of the Far East depended entirely upon China's ability to beat back the aggressor.<sup>392</sup> When Britain and America declared in October, 1942 that they were ready to abandon all their privileges in China, *The Hindu* noted it with satisfaction that China had been accepted as the mistress of her own house.<sup>393</sup>

India's contacts with China were strengthened more by Radha Krishnan's visit to China in March, 1944. Radha Krishnan was given warm reception by the Chinese people. In China he stressed the need of a lasting alliance between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party.<sup>394</sup> He also stated that if the non-aggressive nations of China and India would pull together in the years to come they would contribute effectively to the rebuilding of the World on Saner foundations.<sup>395</sup>

Indian nationalists were shocked to see the internal dissension mounting up in China between the Nationalists and the Communists. As the war approached its end, rift between the Kuomintang and the Communist widened more in scope. This caused grave concern among the Indian leaders. Indians did not take side with one party or the other in China and pleaded for conciliation. K. B. Vaidya, an Indian long resident in China, alleged that even sections in India showed preferences as between Nationalists and the Communists and stated that even the Indian Medical Mission and its leader preferred to work with the Communist Army in Sian and Yen-an in Shensi instead of at Ichang or Kwangsi where the Nationalists were fighting against the Japanese forces. The Mission was sent to Nationalist China but it was allowed by the Chinese Medical and Red Cross authorities to work with the Communists when its leader, Dr. M. Atal, showed definite preference to work with the Eighth Route Army of the Communists. Chiang Kai Shek noticed this discrimination made by the Indian Medical Mission. It was the reason that those of the members who returned to India were not interviewed by Chiang Kai Shek on their way back after a long period of their service to China, not even Dr. M. Atal, the leader of the Mission, because no such interview was sought and the only messages that they brought home from China to the Indian National Congress were from Mao Tse Tung and other Communist leaders.<sup>396</sup>

But this statement of K.B. Vaidya could not be taken as an authentic account because all sections of the Chinese people appreciated the action of the Indian National Congress in sending the Medical Mission to China. Furthermore, in his message to Nehru in March, 1939, Shelly Wang of the Chinese Foreign Office at Chungking and not belonging to the Communist Party, spoke very high of the works done by the Indian Medical Mission.<sup>397</sup> These facts suggested that in sending the Mission the Indians did not want to support the Communists against the Nationalists in China. Indian Press urged the Chinese leaders to close their ranks and to forget their differences to make China a strong and united nation. *The Hindustan Times* dated May 18, 1945,<sup>398</sup> and *The Hindu* of November 2, 1945,<sup>399</sup> made repeated requests to the Chinese people to forget their differences and to live as a single united nation. *The Hindustan Times* dated August 8, 1945 emphatically declared "A united China is essential to peace as much as united India".<sup>400</sup>

India's interest in China became more intense with the release of the Congress leaders in June, 1945. On June 25, 1945, Nehru in an interview to Paul Fang, special correspondent of the *Central News Agency*, China, pointed out that during his three years of imprisonment not a day passed when he did not think of China and her gallant struggle. Expressing his goodwishes for China, he sent greetings to the Chinese people and hoped that the friendship and co-operation of China and India are not only necessary for them, but also for the peace and freedom of the rest of the World.<sup>401</sup> By July, 1945, it seemed that Japanese would surrender very soon and China would get rid of the long protracted war she had been fighting against the Japanese imperialism. Indians too felt a sense of relief and noted with satisfaction the chances of war coming to an end. *The Hindustan Times* in its editorial captioned "China and Eight years of War" thanked the patience of the Chinese people and Chiang Kai Shek's unfailing courage and resourceful leadership that China had survived.<sup>402</sup>

Thus, during 1930 and 1945, Indian National Movement was drawn very close to China and a new kind of relationship developed between the two neighbours of Asia.

Japan, which had been very popular with Indian nationalist leaders, ran a low estimation in Indian public in the fourth and fifth decades of the 20th century. Japan began to be disliked for her imperialistic adventures in China and admiration for Japan reached the lowest ebb when Japan overran the whole of East Asia and reached the borders of India. Nevertheless, there was a section of Indian people which still had faith in Japan and which pinned up its hope of liberation of India in the rise of Japan. When the majority in India condemned Japan for her policies in China, the Hindu Mahasabha did not share the views of the Congress in the condemnation of Japan. The General Secretary of the All India Hindu Mahasabha asked the Premier and the people of Japan to believe that Hindu India was not with the Congress in the latter's condemnation of Japan.<sup>403</sup> Even in the Congress circle there were some leaders who did not favour the condemnation of Japanese activities in the Far East. Among these leaders was Subhas Chandra Bose. When a Medical Mission was organised to help China, Subhas Chandra Bose, who happened to be the Congress President for the year 1938, did not approve of any step being taken by the Congress which was anti-Japanese. Yet such was the feeling in the Congress and

the country, wrote Nehru, that Subhas Chandra Bose did not oppose the despatch of Medical Mission to China or many other manifestations of fascist aggression though he was opposed to these manifestations of sympathy.<sup>404</sup> Subhas Chandra Bose thought that the Second World War was a God sent opportunity to the Indian nationalists to press for their demand for complete freedom.<sup>405</sup> He did not want that the Congress should give unwarranted criticisms against the Germans, the Italians or the Japanese.<sup>406</sup> By adopting such an attitude he wanted to suggest that the Congress should tone down its utterances against the militarist activities of Italy, Germany and Japan. Such an attitude was amply demonstrated by the fact that unlike Nehru's two presidential addresses, in April and December, 1936, which had preceded Bose's, the latter said nothing against the Governments of those countries or their policies.<sup>407</sup>

In spite of the severe criticism of Japanese policies some Indians still hoped that Japan would correct herself. Japan's policy undermined the foundation of Asian solidarity but the imposition that Asia was not for the Occident remained as powerful a uniting force as ever. The condemnation of Japan as an aggressor did not contradict this nation. Japan was regarded as a deviationist engaged in unoriental activities.<sup>408</sup> Even Rabindranath Tagore, who was very vocal in disapproving of Japanese activities in the Far East, believed that Japanese behaviour was borrowed from the West and had not touched the people's heart and hoped that an appeal to the moral conscience of Asia would bring Japan back to the proper oriental path.<sup>409</sup>

The depth of Japanese influence on Indian people could be illustrated by the writings of Raja Mahendra Pratap, a great Indian revolutionary patriot living in exile in Japan. He envisaged an ideal World Federation which was to organise the world into Cultural Zones. The entire area from Japan to Tibet was to fall within what he called the Golden Land, while India with the Near East was to make up the Aryan Land. As late as February, 1940, Raja Mehendra Pratap sided with Wang Ching Wei, the Japanese sponsored ruler of China, and declared, "If I were Mr. Wang Ching Wei, I would ask Prince Konoye to come out to Tsiangtao to lead the administration of the entire Golden land. So Long the Golden Army is not organised to defend the Golden frontiers, Japanese troops may be stationed at Tientsin, Shanghai, Hongkong and Hainan Island. We should establish the Golden Federation in our Golden land from Japan to Tibet and from Mongolia to Kwangtung."<sup>410</sup>

Writing in October, 1940 in the Indian Social Reformer, J.M. Ganguli subscribed to Japan's Slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics" and declared, "as regards this Monroe Doctrine, which America justifies on all grounds, including territorial safety, if Japan enunciates similar doctrine for the East, America stakes a threatening mailed fist at her. The status quo in the East must not be disturbed - America says to Japan with an undisguised threat of armed opposition in her voice; which means, in effect, that far off France can own extensive territories in Indo-China, England can possess Hongkong and an empire in Australia and New Zealand, Holland can keep the East Indies, America can fly her flag over the Philippines, not to mention almost every European power retaining concessions in China, but a non-white country must not protest, or aspire to dominate even in its own neighbourhood or think of extending its political influence and territorial limits".<sup>411</sup> Khwaja Ahmad Abbas also admitted in June, 1939 that the "fanatic and reactionary"<sup>412</sup>

Hindus looked upon Japan, with her Buddhist population, as a country whose religion stemmed from Hinduism, and rejoiced that such a country was asserting her power in the Far East. He further pointed out that "Hindu Communalist Organisations"<sup>413</sup> were in sympathy with Japan. Michael Edwardes also pointed out that there were some sophisticated nationalist leaders who had genuine dislike for militarism of Japan but there was "an overwhelming majority"<sup>414</sup> who were quite prepared to win freedom with the help of Japan.<sup>415</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru also noted with consternation that though Japan was not liked, there was a feeling of satisfaction at the collapse of old established European Colonial Powers before the armed strength of an Asian power. Indians felt a sense of relief that Japan was giving a fatal blow to the white supremacy in Asia.<sup>416</sup> Actual pro-Japanese sentiment, wrote Nehru, was practically nil for no one wanted to change masters but he himself admitted that there was a group which was indirectly pro-Japanese in the sense that it wanted to exploit the opportunity offered by the Japanese invasion for Indian freedom and those Indians were encouraged in this task by the broadcasts being made by Subhas Chandra Bose who had escaped from India in 1941.

There was possibility of more and more collaborators with the Japanese, if they saw India in the control of the Japanese invaders.<sup>417</sup> As a consequence of anti-British and pro-Japanese sentiment, there was general satisfaction in India at the initial reverses of the Allied powers in World War Second and in July 1942, the Congress was constrained to note that the increasing anti British feeling of the Indian people had tended to a growing satisfaction among them at the success of Japanese arms.<sup>418</sup> Maulana Azad, in May, 1942, was disturbed to see the pro-Japanese feeling in India and wrote that the majority to the people were then convinced that the British would lose the war and some seemed to welcome a Japanese victory. There was a great bitterness against the British which at times was so intense that they did not think of the consequences of a Japanese conquest of India.<sup>419</sup>

Subhas Chandra Bose was the foremost among the Indian nationalists who favoured Japanese assistance for India's independence. This attitude and many other factors led to the conflict between Subhas Chandra Bose and other Congress leaders which ultimately resulted in Bose's flight to Germany in March, 1941 from where he urged the Indian people not to compromise with Britain and to continue their fight to end the British domination.<sup>420</sup>

But the exploits of Subhas Chandra Bose in Eastern Asia were more romantic and significant than those in Germany. Subhas Chandra Bose's collaboration with Japan formed an important phase of the Asian policy of the Indian National Movement. During the war the Japanese did many things to win India's sympathy. Several powerful radio transmitters were beamed exclusively at India.<sup>421</sup> In the years that preceded the Second World War the Japanese Foreign office was dissatisfied with the unfavourable Indian reaction to the Japanese action in China. But there were some Japanese officials and statesmen who looked upon Subhas Chandra Bose as a possible ally. It was this belief that prompted the Japanese Consul-General at Calcutta, Okazaki, to write to Tokyo on April 30, 1941, sometimes after Bose's arrival in Germany, that the Japanese should establish contact with Bose in Berlin and that arms should be sent to India secretly to strengthen the hands of his militant followers of the Forward Bloc. Within a few months, General Oshimo Hiroshi, the Japanese

ambassador in Berlin informed his Foreign office that he was in close contact with Bose and that the latter was keen to come to the East where he thought he would be more useful for India's cause.<sup>422</sup> Japan tried to win over India's sympathy through the help of Indians living in South East Asia. To know the real state of affairs in India Major Fujiwara Iwaichi, one of the officers of the 8th section of the Second Bureau of the Imperial General Staff, was sent to Bangkok with five commissioned officers and one Hindi speaking interpreter in October, 1941. Major Fujiwara's contact with the Indians in Thailand, particularly the leaders like Swami Satyananda Puri and Bawa Pritam Singh, had encouraging results. The Imperial Conference held on November 15, 1941 to take final decision on the Japan's entry in the war, also favoured the idea that steps should be taken to stimulate Indian independence movement and to liberate her from British control.<sup>423</sup> The Liason Conference of Japan held on January 10, 1942 laid down that the Japanese immediate aim regarding India was only to cut off her sea communications and to encourage her leaders to rise against Britain.<sup>424</sup>

Japan's policy towards India took a new turn in December, 1941 when the British Indian Army surrendered in Malaya. Major Fujiwara met the Indian captain Mohan Singh and developed a strong liking for each other. It was Mohan Singh who suggested that Subhas Chandra Bose should be brought to the East from Germany. Fujiwara, who desired to establish a strong link with India and to utilise the situation against the British, placed before his departmental head, Lt. Col. Ozaki, an elaborate plan which suggested that Japan should clarify her policy towards India, help Bose to come to the East, assist the Indian nationalists in all possible ways to achieve freedom and reorganise and strengthen the agencies doing liaison work with the Indians.<sup>425</sup> Fujiwara's plan was strengthened when fifty-five thousand Indian soldiers surrendered to the Japanese army after the fall of Singapore in February, 1942. Major Fujiwara invited Indians and said, "England's power is dwindling and that is the opportunity for India to strike for independence". Japan is prepared to give all assistance to Indians to attain their independence".<sup>426</sup> Fujiwara went to Japan in the beginning of March, 1942 but to his utter surprise he found that his home Government was not so enthusiastic about India and he himself was replaced by Col. Iwakuro who did not share Fujiwara's enthusiasm for India.<sup>427</sup> Japan's sympathy for India remained mostly limited and her attitude towards India was neither clear nor committal. Japanese became irritated at the attitude of the Indian delegates to the Singapore Conference held in March, 1942, who still looked to their leaders at home for guidance.<sup>428</sup>

Rash Bihari Bose, an Indian revolutionary living in Tokyo, favoured Indo-Japanese collaboration against the British. On his invitation a conference was held from 28th to March 30, 1942 at Tokyo where it was decided to start an Independence Movement among the Indians in East Asia. It was also decided that military action against India would be taken only by the Indian National Army and under the commands of Indians together with such military, naval and air co-operation that might be requested from the Japanese authorities by the Council of Action of the Indian Independence League to be formed. The Conference decided to summon a fully representative conference of Indians at Bangkok in June, 1942.<sup>429</sup> The Bangkok Conference held in June, 1942 inaugurated the Indian Independence League

with a definite aim to attain complete independence of India.<sup>430</sup> On September 1, 1942, the Indian National Army was formally organised and Mohan Singh became the Commander-in-Chief of the Army.<sup>431</sup> The works of the Indian Independence League were hampered by the rift caused between the League and the Japanese authorities on the question of the control of the Indian prisoners and civilians in Japanese occupied territories. The rift widened in dimension in December 1942 when Iwakuro made it clear that it was not possible for Japan to make any announcement regarding India except in company with her Axis partners.<sup>432</sup> This rift between the Indian Independence League and Japan produced a crisis in December, 1942 when the Council of Action of the Indian Independence League refused to allow the Indian National Army to be transferred to Burma before all outstanding points had been clarified by the Japanese Government. Mohan Singh dissolved the Indian National Army much against the wishes of Rash Bihari Bose and Ananda Mohan Sahay.<sup>433</sup> This audacity on the part of Mohan Singh and Niranjana Singh Gill found them in Japanese custody.<sup>434</sup>

Despite these differences, the Japanese encouraged the Indian nationalist leaders in their task of liberating their homeland. After the fall of Singapore on February 15, 1942, Japanese Premier Hideki Tojo in his message to the Diet on February 16, 1942, declared : "It is a golden opportunity for India having as she does, several thousand years of history and splendid cultural tradition to rid herself of the ruthless despotism to Britain and participate in the construction of the Greater East Asia Co prosperity Sphere. Japan expects that India will restore her proper status as India for the Indians and she will not stint herself in extending assistance to the patriotic efforts to the Indians".<sup>435</sup> Addressing the plenary session of the House of Peers and House of Representatives held on March 12, 1942, the Japanese Premier Tojo reiterated his earlier stand towards India and stated that the time had come when the Indians could realise their long cherished desire to make India for the Indians. It was a critical time when the Indians were to decide whether they would stand up to share the glory of the construction of the Greater East Co-prosperity Sphere as India for Indians or remain for ever as slaves under American and British bonds.<sup>436</sup> The Japanese Premier expressed deep sympathy for those Indians who were likely to suffer ravages of war because it was never the idea of Japan to consider "the Indian people as enemy".<sup>437</sup>

Intense nationalist fervour in India compelled the British Government to send Cripps Mission in March, 1942 to India to suggest measures for the solution of Indian problems. But the Cripps Mission failed in its objectives. The rejection of the Cripps proposals by the Indians was regarded by Premier Tojo of Japan as India's spiritual independence from Britain. In a speech to the 80th session of Diet on May 27, 1942, the Japanese Premier declared that the failure of the Cripps Mission was the first historic step towards Indian independence. The Japanese Premier expressed the hope that the Indian people would rise with an intrepid spirit, expel the Anglo-American forces and their influence completely from India and thereby restore the independence of their country.<sup>438</sup> The Japanese Foreign Minister Shigenori Togo also urged the Indians to rise courageously in order to win India's emancipation.<sup>439</sup> Other sections of people also declared their sympathy for India's freedom and encouraged the Indians to strike against the British rulers.

Shigetomo Sayegusa in an article on "India's Role in Totalitarian World" emphatically asserted the need for proper information to be given to the Indians that Japan entertained sincere sympathy for the cause of Indian independence and added that the Japanese nation as a whole was prepared to assist the nationalist leaders in India in their fight for freedom. Sympathising with the Indian national aspirations he declared that the British would not grant freedom to Indians unless the latter organised themselves.<sup>440</sup> Another Japanese, Kat Sugi Inahara, in his article entitled "India's struggle for Freedom" written in May, 1942 condemned the British Rule in India. It was surprising to find that the writer paid tributes to Gandhi and Nehru despite their anti-Japanese attitude.<sup>441</sup> Writing in September, 1942 Katsugi Inahara viewed the Quit India Movement as a part of world upheaval in the international conflict and stated that the uprising was a new attempt for national liberation in India.<sup>442</sup> Another contemporary Japanese, Naokichi Tanaka, offered Japan's unequivocal support to the Indian struggle for independence. In his article captioned *Albion in India*, Inahara justified India's demand for complete independence from Britain. Emphasising the cultural intimacy between India and Japan and acknowledging the cultural and philosophic assistance, Japan had received from India in the past, Inahara pointed out that Japan was mentally and emotionally so close to India that to Japan the sorrow of India affects as its own sorrow.<sup>443</sup> Addressing the eighty-second session of the Diet on June 16, 1943, the Japanese Premier Tojo expressed sympathy with India passing through terrible ordeal in the process of attaining her complete independence and promised that Japan is firmly resolved to exhaust all means in order to help expel and eliminate from India Anglo-Saxon influence which are the enemy of the Indian people and enable India to attain full independence in true sense of the term.<sup>444</sup>

India's collaboration with Japan widened in scope with Bose's arrival in the East to lead the Indian National Army aiming at the complete elimination of British influence from the Soil of India. Bose arrived in Japan towards the middle of June, 1943 from where he proceeded to Singapore to take the leadership of the Indian Independence Movement. The Indian Independence Movement under the leadership of Subhas Chandra Bose was not only the beginning of a new chapter in the history of India's struggle for freedom but also marked a new turn in Japanese attitude towards Indian Nationalism. The provisional Government of Azad Hind was formed on October 21, 1943 and Subhas Chandra Bose, popularly known as Netaji, took the Oath of allegiance to India and other members of the Government also followed him. The Japanese Government accorded recognition to it and treated it as an independent and free Government and pledged to extend it all possible assistance.<sup>445</sup> On October 20, 1943, Netaji went to Tokyo where he attended the Greater East Asia Conference in the first week of November, 1943. The Japanese Emperor accorded him with all honours due to the Head of a state. The Japanese Premier announced on November 6, 1943 that as a mark of appreciation of the Provisional Government of India, Japan had decided to handover the Andaman and Nicobar Islands to the Provisional Government of Azad Hind. Thus the Provisional Government acquired its first say on a territory in Free India.<sup>446</sup>

Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose and his followers expressed desire to participate in the Japanese offensive against British India. But Japanese Field Marshall Count

Terauchi, the Commander of the Japanese Forces in South East Asia, did not want to include the Indian National Army in the group that was to proceed towards India. He further thought that Subhas Chandra Bose should assist the Japanese army in liberating India by enlisting the goodwill of the Indian people and should do only the espionage works for the Japanese army. Bose did not want to do only the espionage work and after his resistance Japanese consented to the Indian National Army's participation in the campaign<sup>447</sup> and some members of the Azad Hind Fauj were attached to the different units of the Japanese army as irregulars.<sup>448</sup>

In May, 1944 the Indian National Army took possession of the British post on the Indian side situated at Mowdok which created panic in the British forces. Soldiers of the Azad Hind Fauj laid themselves flat on the ground and kissed the sacred soil of their motherland which they had set out to liberate. Furthermore, when the Japanese forces decided to withdraw from Mowdok and advised the Azad Hind Fauj commander to retreat because they were faced with grim difficulties caused by troubles in supply as well as impending counter-attack of the British forces, the officers of the I.N.A. unanimously refused to do so saying that the "Japanese could retreat because Tokyo lies that way; our goal the Red Fort, Delhi lies ahead of us. We have orders to go to Delhi. There is no going back for us".<sup>449</sup> Thereupon a company of troops under captain Suraj Mal was left at Mowdok. The Japanese army officers were so much impressed by the heroic and patriotic zeal of the I.N.A. men that some Japanese troops, for the first time in the history of Japanese army were placed under the command of a foreign officer, Suraj Mal.<sup>450</sup>

The Indian National Army unfurled its flag on the top of the hills at Kohima in Assam and the Japanese forces made attempts to capture Imphal.<sup>451</sup> But under the exigencies of the situation the balance went in favour of the British and the British counter-offensive attempts made in 1944-45 forced the Japanese to retreat. With the retreat of Japan also came the tragic end of the attempts made by the Indian National Army to liberate India. Seeing through his own naked eyes the tragic end of his attempts to liberate his motherland with Japanese collaboration, Subhas left Formosa on August 18, for Tokyo. The latter history of this great Indian freedom fighter had been one of the mysteries.

Though the ambitious plan of Netaji and I.N.A. to liberate India through Japanese help collapsed but the revolutionary spirit generated by the I.N.A. and its Netaji forced the British to think that India could no longer be held in subjection.

The heroic exploits of Netaji and the Azad Hind Fauj and the Japanese collaboration with this revolutionary India enterprise to liberate India from British domination formed a brilliant chapter in history of Indo-Japanese collaboration. During the war, years the Americans and British statesmen deemed Netaji to be a puppet or a Quisling but he was not so to the Indians and the men in the Indian National Army were first and foremost Indian patriots and were for Japan only to the extent that Japan was for India.<sup>452</sup> Bose and his supporters became in India symbols of a United Asia fighting for freedom.<sup>453</sup> Subhas Chandra Bose was out and out a nationalist and he wanted to get Japanese assistance to that extent only which could have helped him in liberating India. He emphatically stated: "Any liberation of India secured through Japanese sacrifices is worse than slavery."<sup>454</sup> The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress had disapproved of the policies of Subhas Chandra Bose as

early as 1941, but the same Congress and Nehru in 1945 certified that the members of the I.N.A. were motivated by a "passion for freedom of their country, however misguided".<sup>455</sup> The Congress appealed to the British authorities not to punish the members of the I.N.A. who were being put to trial by the British authorities in India. Popular agitation and strong public opinion and a wave of excitement throughout the country forced the British authorities to leave unpunished the members of the I.N.A. who, according to the Indian nationalists, were brave patriots, had fought for the independence of India. The Congress constituted a committee of the eminent lawyers of India to defend the I.N.A. members. Bhulabhai Desai, the Chief Defence Counsel and a prominent Congress Leader, openly asserted, "Legal allegiance can not be a matter of perpetuity. If it is so, no subject race will ever attain freedom".<sup>456</sup> When the I.N.A. men were put on trial, popular and widespread demonstrations were held from Calcutta to Lahore and Bombay, and from Lucknow to Madras, occasionally accompanied by violence in support of the demand to release the I.N.A. men and sometimes police had to resort to firing to crush the popular enthusiasm and violence of the supporters of the I.N.A.<sup>457</sup> Even the Muslim League took up the defence of the accused personnel of the band of patriotic heroes who had fought for the liberation of their motherland from the Shackles of the British domination.<sup>458</sup> Thus, the whole nation stood for the I.N.A. and regarded the attempts made by the Azad Hind Fauj as War of independence against alien rule.

It would be proper to analyse the Japanese motives behind her support to the I.N.A. and her proclamation in support of Indian independence. Japanese announcements were more of a tactical move and were dictated by strategic considerations. A.J. Barker wrote that even in 1944, when the Japanese army was ordered into India it was with limited objective of securing strategic areas near Imphal and in the North East India for the defence of Burma, another auxiliary objective being the disruption of the air-routes between India and Chungking.<sup>459</sup> F.C. Jones held the view that Japan did not actually want to liberate Asia. What the Japanese really wanted was the consent of the Western Maritime Powers to their hegemony in East Asia and only when it was clear that this would not be assented by the Maritime Powers that the Pan-Asiatic note became dominant in Japanese policies.<sup>460</sup>

Undoubtedly, the real intentions of the Japanese were something more than what seemed to be on the surface. Even the Indians felt that the Japanese announcements formed the part of Japanese strategy to win over the Indians on their side against the Allied Powers and Japanese sympathy for India was part of their tactical move but it was extremely effective in stimulating Indian national sentiment and a sense of indebtedness to Japan.<sup>461</sup> For India, long under the spell of pan-Asian propaganda, and her national movement passing through a period of attrition in its struggle against British imperialism, Japan's slogan of "*India for the Indians*" whatever might be its source, had an appeal.<sup>462</sup>

Furthermore, informed public opinion in India felt concern over the fate of Japan in the post-Second World War period. Even when the war was going on, the Institute of Pacific Relations held a conference in January, 1945 at Virginia in America to discuss the shape of the World Order in post war period and the question of treatment to be given to Japan. H.N. Kunzru, Indian delegate to the conference, declared, "we must not adopt an overharsh attitude towards the Japanese

people. The way to guard against another Japanese attack is to have a strong India and China".<sup>463</sup> A group of specialists from Western countries favoured the complete military and economic disarmament of Japan and the establishment of a collaborationist regent to take the place of Emperor Hirohito without completely abolishing the Emperor's constitution of 1896. But the Indian delegation, moved by an Asian sentiment, advocated *Very mild peace terms for Japan*<sup>464</sup> and insisted that the Japanese should be given economic, political and cultural equality with all peoples throughout the Far East.<sup>465</sup> Speaking at the conference, Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit, an outstanding Indian Leader, opposed the removal of the Japanese Emperor by the Western powers and stated that the Japanese nation should not be humiliated and should be left to decide its internal problems in the manner it thought fit for the nation.<sup>466</sup>

All these expressions and sentiments confirmed that India's solidarity with Japan had suffered little by Japan's imperialistic adventures. The condemnation of Japanese policies would have remained less vocal if the danger of Japanese invasion on India had not been imminent. India's disapproval of the Japanese policies could not afford to destroy the delicate but indivisible links which combined the hearts of the two peoples of Asia. Furthermore, the solicitude shown by Indian leaders for the fate of Japan in the post-war world made it crystal clear that the basic solidarity of India with Japan had suffered little by Japan's temporary betrayal of the Oriental path.

#### **India and Regional Integration in Asia**

During the period from 1930 to 1945 one of the main planks of the Indian attempts for developing close contacts with Asian countries was the move for regional integration in Asia or for some sort of Asiatic Federation. Numerous schemes for Asiatic Federation were envisaged by the nationalist leaders. The Indian National Congress in 1928 directed its Working Committee to correspond with the leaders of other Asian countries and to take necessary steps to summon in India in 1930, the first session of a Pan-Asiatic Federation in which India should be the leader of a renaissance Asia.<sup>467</sup> But this Pan-Asiatic Conference could not be held in India in 1930 for by that time the Congress became deeply engrossed in internal problems. Mass Civil Disobedience, Meerut Conspiracy Case, Round Table Conference and the all absorbing pre-occupations of the Congress did not allow India to see to her friends in East.

Nevertheless, the idea of an Asiatic Federation remained a living part of Indian Nationalist Thought. To give a practical shape to it, the All India Women's Conference convened the first All Asian Women's Conference in January 1931. The All Asian Women's Conference held at Lahore marked a new turn in India's attempts for Asian solidarity. Explaining the desirability of this Conference, Lakshmi Bai G. Rajwade, the Honorary Secretary of the Conference remarked, "Feeling the necessity of establishing a closer contact between the various Asian countries for the purpose of bringing about a keener realisation of their cultural unity, the organisers of the Conference considered that as a first step they should endeavour to bring the women of the different countries of Asia together, it being their belief that women were fundamental, custodians of the cultural life of a nation".<sup>468</sup> A Bulletin issued in November, 1930 defined the objectives of the Conference which were to promote

the consciousness of unity amongst the women of Asia as members of a common Oriental Culture, to take stock of the qualities of Oriental Civilisation so as to preserve them for national and world service, to review and seek remedies for the defects apparent in Oriental Civilisation, to shift what was appropriate for Asia from the occidental influences, to strengthen one another by exchange of data and experience concerning women's conditions in their respective countries of Asia and to promote world peace.<sup>469</sup>

On the opening day the Conference was presided over by Lady Bandarnaike of Ceylon as Mrs Sarojini Naidu, who was to preside over the session, was in Jail.<sup>470</sup> Ceylon, Burma, Persia, Japan and Afghanistan sent their delegates to this Conference. The Conference received messages of greetings and goodwill from Syria, Indonesia and Japan. Madame Nasib Abed Beyhun of Syria, congratulated Indian women for their initiative in the summoning of the Conference.<sup>471</sup> The Women Association of Indonesia declared that the Women of Asia welcomed the project of the Indian Women to bring together the scattered communities of Asia and the Oriental Culture for the service of Asia and the World.<sup>472</sup> Miss Taki Fujia, Correspondence Secretary, Japan Women's Committee for International Affairs, expressed gratitude to the Women of India for taking the initiative in convening this conference and emphatically stated that it was the opportune moment when the women of Asia should make a determined effort to understand one another and work together.<sup>473</sup>

The initiative taken by the Indian Women to bring the Asiatic Women into one bond was highly appreciated by Rabindranath Tagore and Sardar Jogendra Singh, Minister of Agriculture of Punjab. The latter regarded the Conference as the symbol of the reawakening of the Asian Women and as an unparalleled movement in the history of the world. He viewed it with satisfaction that the women of Asia were taking control of the new forces at start with a view to inspire and guide the new awakening and bring harmony to the countries of the East which might have dispersed their powers without using them for common good.<sup>474</sup>

The Conference discussed the various problems: social, economic, spiritual, political and educational. Several suggestions were put forward to improve the lot of women folk in Asia and to remove the inherent defects in the Asian societies and culture. The conference urged the necessity of retaining the high spiritual consciousness which had been the fundamental characteristic of the people of Asia throughout their history and desired that the Women of Asia should maintain that high standard uninfluenced by the materialist trends of modern times.<sup>475</sup> The Conference resolved that another Asian conference should be summoned at the end of two or three years and a Secretary be appointed and a small committee selected to carry on this work till the time, particularly investigating the possibilities of co-operating with the Oriental Women's Congress to be held in Teheran in 1933, and if this was not possible, to correspond with other countries as regards choice of the place for the next Conference to be held after a minimum period of two years. The Conference also decided to publish a full report of the Conference and to establish an Asian Academy for collection of information concerning the arts and other cultural subjects and sciences. Dr. Muthu Lakshmi Reddi of India was appointed as the Liaison Officer of the Asian Women's Conference to establish contacts with

the League of Nations.<sup>476</sup>

Though the Conference had no political purposes, and the Asiatic Federation could not emerge from the conference as no such conference as proposed at the first Conference was summoned in future, and no permanent organisation was created to do the work of promoting solidarity among the nations of Asia, nevertheless the conference went much further in the way of consolidating the mutual collaboration among the nations of Asia, particularly among the Women of Asia. The very meeting of the conference was a great thing in itself and it was the small beginning of a big mission. Mrs. A. K. Rafi, moving the vote of thanks, regarded the conference a success and stated, "we have met together, have exchanged our ideas on different subjects and have discussed the various problems relating to our various countries. We have found that although separated by strong physical barriers and kept apart by various social and political reasons yet we all belong to one great family, have our common culture, and one civilisation."<sup>477</sup>

Indian attempts to form an Asiatic Federation were strengthened by India's participation in Asiatic conferences summoned for this purpose. One such conference, which made attempts to institutionalise the dream of Asiatic Federation, and in which India played a determining role, was the Pan-Asiatic Labour Conference held at Colombo, Ceylon in May 1934. Though the conference was described as an Asian conference yet it had no complete Asian Complex in the sense that only Japan, India and Ceylon participated in the conference. T. Kikukawa, K. Sujuki, E. Jwang, E. Sujuki and I. Aisawa represented Japan on the conference. India was represented by Jamnadas Mehta, K.M. Joshi, and S.C. Joshi. Ceylonese representatives at the conference included A.E. Goonesinha, S.W. Dassenaik, Dr. C.J.C. Desilva, and Kanga Sundaram.<sup>478</sup>

This Pan-Asiatic Labour Conference passed a number of resolutions which viewed Asian problems in Asian context and emphasised the need of a concerted action by the Asiatic nations to promote the interests of the workers and the labourers of Asia. The conference viewed with alarm the economic condition and distress of the industrial workers in Asia and held the financial exchange and fiscal policies of the Governments responsible for the miserable lot of the workers in Asia and protested against all economies in the name of nationalisation. The conference expressed the opinion that the grant of political freedom and the right of self-determination to such of the countries of Asia as were under foreign domination was essential in the interests of international understanding and world peace. Representing the Asian sentiment of anguish at the imperialist policies of the Western powers, the conference opposed the use of Ordinances and repressive legislation for the suppression of political and civil liberties of the people of India and elsewhere. It requested the International Labour Organisation to make the arrangements for the direct representation of the Colonies and dependencies to make International Labour Conference truly international. It further urged the International Labour Organisation to expedite the holding of an Asiatic Labour Conference and to provide a minimum of two seats to Asiatic Labour on the governing body of the I.L.O. It called upon all national labour organisations in Asia to exchange fraternal delegates from other Asiatic countries to their annual conference and assured the International Federation of Trade Union of its full co-operation with it in all matters of common interest.<sup>479</sup>

India played an important role in this gathering of Asian labour leaders to foment a common bond of friendship. The importance of India was well recognised at the conference and an Indian was included as one of three Vice-Presidents, other two being Chinese and Ceylonese. Of the two secretaries one was to be from Japan and the other from India. Attaching a remarkable status to Indian labour movement and the role of Indian labourers in Asia, the conference decided to hold its next session in India.<sup>480</sup>

This Pan-Asiatic Labour Conference demonstrated the rising spirit of the East making all attempts to revive the vitality of Asia and to exempt Asia from the exploitation of the West. One feature of the conference was that it did not confine to labour problems only. It also asked for political and civil liberties of those Asiatic people who were under alien domination. Jamnadas Mehta, the leader of the Indian delegation to the conference, asked the delegates at the conference not to be mindful of the small beginning of the conference and expressed the hope that although the beginning "is small as we all recognise it, there rises before my eyes the vision of the future of the Asiatic Labour Conference composed of delegates representing the continent of Asia, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, India, China, Japan and many others. In fact, when the Congress is more fully developed half of the World will sit round it and its deliberations will influence all world organisations".<sup>481</sup> T. Kikukawa, a Japanese delegate, declared, "To day Japan unites with India in forming a social collaboration for the realisation of Justice. It is my hearty prayer that we will continue to collaborate for the upliftment of the conditions of labour throughout Asia."<sup>482</sup>

This Pan-Asiatic Labour Conference did not aim at the creation of a movement against the labour movements of the West. Deploring the inadequate representation of Asia at the International Labour Conference, K.M. Joshi, the Indian delegate, frankly declared : "Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress was not meant to be separate from or antagonistic to the labour movements in other parts of the World. They realised that the strength of the workers lay in their solidarity."<sup>483</sup>

The Pan-Asiatic Labour Conference, though not fully Asian in character, left an indelible mark on the growing consciousness of fellow-feeling among the Asian nations and the role India played at the conference was note-worthy in the sense that it was eager to develop close contracts with other Asian nations and to foster a workable union of the Asian countries to remove some of the disabilities of the Asian people.

Even during the war years of 1939-45 when Indian nationalists were deeply engrossed in their domestic affairs, the scheme of Asiatic Federation exercised its influence on their minds. They worked out their arrangements in conformity with the spirit of the times on an "optimistic and slightly idealistic plane" and usually contemplated an Asian Federation for the purpose of promoting freedom and welfare of the nations of Asia.<sup>484</sup> Nehru, in the course of a long article under the caption "The Parting of the Ways" explained that Indians did not want to be bound down to a group of nations which had exploited and dominated them. Indians wanted to be completely free with no reservations or exceptions, except such as the Indians themselves accepted, in common with others, in order to foster a Federation of Nations or a new World Order. If this new World Order or Fede-

ration did not materialise in the near future, Nehru added, they would like to be closely associated in a Federation with their neighbours such as China, Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan and Persia.<sup>485</sup> The All India Congress Committee in August, 1942 envisaged an ambitious plan for the formation of a World Federation based on the equality and freedom of all dependent nations. But behind this craze for World Federation was the inherent idea of Asiatic organisation. The Congress Committee declared that the freedom of India must be the symbol of and prelude to the freedom of all other Asiatic nations under foreign domination.<sup>486</sup>

Indian Muslims and their Muslim League did not favour the formation of an all Asian Federation. Their eyes were fixed on the politics of the Middle Eastern Countries. Some of the leaders of the Muslim League hoped for a union of Muslim nations of Asia. Chowdhury Kahliq-uz-Zamman, a veteran Muslim League leader, envisaged a plan of the union of Islamic countries of Asia in which Muslim India was also to be included.<sup>487</sup> Similar sentiments were expressed by Jinnah in his address to the Punjab Muslim Student's Federation held at Lahore on March 18, 1944.<sup>488</sup>

The Hindus organised under the banner of the Hindu Mahasabha had in their minds the desire to work out a federation of all those nations of Asia which believed in Hindu or Buddhist religion. The militant wing of the Hindu Mahasabha wanted to create a Pan-Buddhistic Bloc composed of Japan, India, Tibet, Thailand, Ceylon, Combodia, Java, China and Burma.<sup>489</sup>

Whatever might have been the motives behind these two trends of thinking for the formation of an Asiatic Federation, these schemes added strength to the Indians' desire to foster solidarity amongst the nations of Asia. Besides these moves based on religious sentiments and affiliations there was a similar movement based on geographical, political and strategic interests and needs which aimed at the creation of an Asiatic Federation or some sort of Union of Asia. Nehru, who had been a passionate advocate of regional integration in Asia, wrote in 1944 : "Conditions and problems differ greatly in the various countries of Asia, but throughout this vast area, in China and India, in South East Asia, in Western Asia and the Arab World, run common threads of sentiment and invisible links which hold them together."<sup>490</sup> Speaking in Kashmir in August 1945, Nehru said : "Small states of the world of tomorrow have no future in store and they are sure to be reduced to the status of satellite states. I stand for a South Asia Federation of India, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and Burma."<sup>491</sup>

Some more suggestions were made by Indian scholars for the evolution of an Asiatic Federation. Krishnalal Shridharani in his book entitled "*Warning to the West*", first published in 1942 and then in 1944, talked of an Asiatic Federation to counteract European arrogance and to promote Asian Welfare. To Shridharani, the cry for a continental bloc of Asiatic peoples and their governments was a defence mechanism and was largely an answer to the arrogant West which was still unwilling to concede the right to self-determination to the Asiatic people.<sup>492</sup> Among the Indians who discussed the problem of Asiatic Federation from a more realistic and nationalistic angle, K.M. Panikkar was the foremost. In his book entitled "*The Future of South East Asia*", Panikkar advocated a regional organisation comprising India and South East Asia, in which the responsibility for defence was to fall on

**India and Indonesia.**

Thus, the period from 1930 to 1945 marked the consolidation of the movement for Asian Solidarity in India. During this period, all shades of opinions in India were deeply moved by an urge to develop friendly relations and close collaboration with the nations of Asia most of which were comrades-in-bondage fighting for independence from White Supremacy.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>Tendulkar, *Mahatma, Life of Mohan Das Karamchand Gandhi*, vol. II, pp. 427-505.
- <sup>2</sup>Christine Dobbin, (ed), *op. cit*; pp. 99-100.
- <sup>3</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit*; vol. I, p. 365.
- <sup>4</sup>D. Singh (ed), *Famous Letters and Ultimatums to the British Government*, (1944), p. 20.
- <sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 20-29.
- <sup>6</sup>S. Gopal, *The Viceroyalty of Lord Irwin 1926-31*, (1931), p. 70.
- <sup>7</sup>Tendulkar, *op. cit*; vol. II, pp. 25-26.
- <sup>8</sup>C.H. Philips (ed), *The Evolution of India and Pakistan, 1858-1947*, *op. cit*: pp. 241-42.
- <sup>9</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Autobiography*, p. 259.
- <sup>10</sup>Tendulkar, *op. cit*; Vol. III, pp. 66-164.
- <sup>11</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit*; Vol. I, pp. 516-17.
- <sup>12</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Autobiography*, p. 327.
- <sup>13</sup>A.C. Banerjee, *Indian Constitutional Documents 1757-1939*, (1948), Vol. III, pp. 200-03.
- <sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 204-05.
- <sup>15</sup>Pattabhi Sitaramayya *op. cit*; Vol. I, pp. 562-63.
- <sup>16</sup>Christine Dobbin, *op. cit*; pp. 119-21.
- <sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>18</sup>J.L. Nehru, *India and the World*, (1936), p. 86.
- <sup>19</sup>B.N. Pandey, *op. cit*; p. 141.
- <sup>20</sup>*Return Showing the Results of Elections in India, 1937*, Cmd, 5589.
- <sup>21</sup>Viscount Templewood, *Nine Troubled Years*, (1954), p. 52.
- <sup>22</sup>Sir Bijoy Prasad Singh Roy, *Parliamentary Government in India*, (1943), pp. 366-67.
- <sup>23</sup>*The Statesman*, Calcutta, January 7, 1937.
- <sup>24</sup>*Returns showing the Results of Elections in India, 1937*, Cmd, 5589.
- <sup>25</sup>Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, *op. cit*; pp. 160-62.
- <sup>26</sup>Sir Harry Haig, *The United Provinces and the New Constitution*; *The Asiatic Review*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 127, pp. 428-29.
- <sup>27</sup>R. Coupland, *The Indian Problem, Report on the Constitutional Problem in India*, Part II, (1944), p. 183.
- <sup>28</sup>*Congress and War Crisis*, (Allahabad), pp. 14-25.
- <sup>29</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. II, p. 70.
- <sup>30</sup>*Congress and War Crisis*, *op. cit*; pp. 40-50
- <sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 58.
- <sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 65-67.
- <sup>33</sup>Cited in B.N. Pandey, *op. cit*; p. 150.
- <sup>34</sup>Jamil-ud-Din Ahmand, *Speeches and Writings of Jinnah*, Vol. I, p. 98.
- <sup>35</sup>V.P. Menon, *The Transfer of Power in India*, (1957), p. 72.
- <sup>36</sup>Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (ed), *Leaders' Correspondence with Jinnah*, (1944), p. 147.
- <sup>37</sup>Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *op. cit*; p. 138.
- <sup>38</sup>C.H. Philips (ed), *op. cit*; pp. 354-55.
- <sup>39</sup>K.K. Datta, *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, p. 78.
- <sup>40</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, April 12, 1940.
- <sup>41</sup>R. Coupland, *op. cit*; Part II, pp. 333-35.
- <sup>42</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Unity of India*, p. 379.
- <sup>43</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, September 7, 1940.
- <sup>44</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, January 9, 1942.
- <sup>45</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit*, p. 98.
- <sup>46</sup>R. Coupland. *op. cit*; Part II, pp. 335-36.
- <sup>47</sup>Christine Dobbin, *op. cit*; pp. 140-41.
- <sup>48</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *op. cit*; p. 120.
- <sup>49</sup>Louis Fischer, *A Week with Gandhi*, p. 55.

- <sup>50</sup>Sir Maurice Gwyer and A. Appadorai (ed), *Speeches and Documents on the Indian Constitutions 1921-47*, Vol. II, (1957), p. 525.
- <sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 536-37.
- <sup>52</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, April 22, 1942.
- <sup>53</sup>Durga Das, *India from Curzon to Nehru and After*, (1969), p. 205.
- <sup>54</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League from April, 1942 to May 1943*, (Delhi), p. 2.
- <sup>55</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit*; p. 133.
- <sup>56</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 473.
- <sup>57</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, May 23, 1942.
- <sup>58</sup>*Harijan*, May 3, 1942.
- <sup>59</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, November 1, 1945.
- <sup>60</sup>Pattabhi Sītaramayya, *op. cit*; Vol. II, pp. 341-43.
- <sup>61</sup>J.L. Nehru, *A Bunch of Old Letters*, (1958), p. 468-70.
- <sup>62</sup>Pattabhi Sītaramayya, *op. cit*; Vol. II, pp. 373-74.
- <sup>63</sup>J.M. Deb, *India Unreconciled*, (1945), pp. 403-04.
- <sup>64</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, p. 696.
- <sup>65</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit*; p. 145.
- <sup>66</sup>R. Coupland, *op. cit*; part II, p. 304.
- <sup>67</sup>Rajagopalachari, *The Way Out*, November 30, 1943 (O.U.P.)
- <sup>68</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, *op. cit*; pp. 700-01
- <sup>69</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit*; pp. 162-63.
- <sup>70</sup>*Ibid.* -
- <sup>71</sup>*Jinnah-Gandhi Talks*, (September 1944, Delhi), pp. 37-44.
- <sup>72</sup>K.K. Datta, *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, *op. cit*; pp. 87-88
- <sup>73</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, p. 713.
- <sup>74</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit*; p. 179.
- <sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 182-215.
- <sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>77</sup>Khalid B. Sayeed, *op. cit*; p. 133.
- <sup>78</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. XXXVIII, July 1937, p. 439.
- <sup>79</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, May 4, 1939.
- <sup>80</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>81</sup>*Ibid*, June 25, 1939.
- <sup>82</sup>*Harijan*, July, 1, 1939.
- <sup>83</sup>*Ibid*
- <sup>84</sup>*The Amarita Bazar Patrika*, July 18, 1939.
- <sup>85</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. II. p. 7.
- <sup>86</sup>Lanka Sundaram, "Pundit Nehru's Visit : Future of the Indo-Ceylon Relationship", *Ibid*, July 31, 1939.
- <sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>88</sup>*The Star of India*, July 26, 1939.
- <sup>89</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. II, pp. 9-10.
- <sup>90</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Autobiography*, p. 608.
- <sup>91</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. II, pp. 213-14.
- <sup>92</sup>Urmila Phadnis, "The 1964 Indo-Ceylonese Pact and the Stateless Persons in Ceylon," *India Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII, No. 4, 1967, p. 370.
- <sup>93</sup>*All Asian Women's Conference*, First Session, Lahore 19th September to 25th January, 1931, (1931), pp. 33-81.
- <sup>94</sup>*The Indian Review*, Vol. XXXVIII, March 1937, p. 783.
- <sup>95</sup>Sir Charles Jeffries, *Ceylon, The Path to Independence*, (1962), pp. 89-90

- <sup>96</sup>*The Modern Review*, Vol, LXXIV, July 1943, p. 11.
- <sup>97</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 12.
- <sup>98</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Unity of India*, p. 389.
- <sup>99</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. I, pp. 324-26.
- <sup>100</sup>G.P. Bhattacharjee, *India and Politics of Modern Nepal*, (1970), p. 27.
- <sup>101</sup>Shriman Narayan, *India and Nepal*, p. 29.
- <sup>102</sup>Indra Prakash, *A Review of the History and Work of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Hindu Sangathan Movement*, (1938), p. 198.
- <sup>103</sup>V.D. Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan, A Collection of the Presidential Speeches Delivered from the Hindu Mahasabha Platform*, (1949), p. 2.
- <sup>104</sup>Y.N. Khanal, *Background of Nepal's Foreign Policy*, p. 2.
- <sup>105</sup>G.P. Bhattacharjee, *op. cit*; pp. 24-25.
- <sup>106</sup>*The Modern Review*, Vol. LXVIII, August 1940, p. 121.
- <sup>107</sup>*The Star of India*, September 9, 1932.
- <sup>108</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>109</sup>*The Modern Review*, Vol. LII, October, 1932, pp. 470-71.
- <sup>110</sup>*Young India*, September 24, 1931.
- <sup>111</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. II, p. 259.
- <sup>112</sup>*The Modern Review*, Vol. II, 1932, pp. 590-91.
- <sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. LXVII, 1935, p. 748.
- <sup>114</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1937, Vol. I, p. 235.
- <sup>115</sup>*Independent India*, Vol. I, No. 10. June 6, 1937, p. 4.
- <sup>116</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1943, Vol. I, p. 276.
- <sup>117</sup>*The Indian National Congress, March, 1940 to September, 1946* p. 32.
- <sup>118</sup>*The Modern Review*, June, 1945, Vol. LXXVII, p. 258.
- <sup>119</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, pp. 71.
- <sup>120</sup>Robert Hardy Andrews : *A Lamp for India, The Story of Madam Pandit*, (1967), p. 218.
- <sup>121</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>122</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, June 26, 1945.
- <sup>123</sup>*The Hindustan Standard*, July 7, 1945.
- <sup>124</sup>Jan Romein, *The Asian Century*, p. 266.
- <sup>125</sup>G.E. Hall, *Burma*, p. 152.
- <sup>126</sup>*The Modern Review*, Vol. LVII, 1935, p. 132.
- <sup>127</sup>*Jayakar Papers*, File No. 454, p. 251.
- <sup>128</sup>Government of India, Reforms Department, K.W. File No. 95/5/30.
- <sup>129</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>130</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>131</sup>Hugh Tinker, *The Union of Burma*, p. 4.
- <sup>132</sup>*Burma Round Table Conference, November 27, 1931-January 12, 1932 Proceedings*, pp. 30-65.
- <sup>133</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 11, 1929.
- <sup>134</sup>*The Indian National Congress 1930-34*, (1934), pp. 65-66.
- <sup>135</sup>Government of India, Reforms Department, K.W. File No. 95/5/30.
- <sup>136</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>137</sup>*Ibid.* File No. 15 Secret 1931.
- <sup>138</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>139</sup>*Ibid.*, K.W. File No. 95/5/30.
- <sup>140</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>141</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>142</sup>Government of India, File No. 15/Secret' 31 Notes.
- <sup>143</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>144</sup>Government of India, Reforms Department, K.W. II, File No. 95/5/30.
- <sup>145</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>146</sup>Government of India, File No. 15/ Secret/31 Reforms.
- <sup>147</sup>*The Leader*, March 19, 1931,
- <sup>148</sup>*The Tribune*, March 19, 1931.

- 148 *The Indian Daily Mail*, January 21, 1931.
- 150 *The Bombay Chronicle*, March 18, 1931.
- 151 *Justice*, March 18, 1931.
- 152 Cited in *The Indian Review*, Vol. XXXVIII, May 1937, p. 301.
- 153 *Independent India*, Vol. I, No. 10, June 6, 1937.
- 154 *The Indian Review*, June 1937, p. 376.
- 155 *Ibid.*
- 156 W.S. Desai, *India and Burma, A Study*, pp. 41-42.
- 157 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. II, p. 166.
- 158 *Ibid.*, p. 278.
- 159 *The Indian Review*, Vol XXXVIII, September 1938, p. 624.
- 160 Maung Maung, *Burma and General Ne Win*, (1969), pp. 63-64.
- 161 Hugh Tinker, *The Union of Burma*, (1967), p. 8.
- 162 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. I, p. 193.
- 163 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 29, 1939.
- 164 J.L. Nebru, *The Unity of India*, p. 389.
- 165 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 276.
- 166 *The Indian National Congress : From March 1940 to September, 1946*, p. 52.
- 167 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, May 6, 1945.
- 168 *Ibid.*, June 26, 1945.
- 170 Maung Maung, *op. cit*; p. 158.
- 170 *Ibid.*, p. 161.
- 171 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, June 26, 1945.
- 172 *Congress Bulletin*, November 1, 1945.
- 173 Werner Levi, *Free India in Asia*, p. 18.
- 174 *The Indian Quarterly Register*, 1929, Vol. I, p. 353.
- 175 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 26, 1929.
- 176 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1934, Vol. I, p. 316.
- 177 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 3, 1934.
- 178 George E. Kirk, *A Short History of the Middle East*, (London 1961), p. 186.
- 179 Jawaharlal Nehru, *Eighteen Months in India 1936-37 Being Further Essays and Writings* (1938) pp. 133-37.
- 180 *The Indian National Congress 1936-37*, p. 25.
- 181 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, July 19, 1936.
- 182 *Ibid.*
- 183 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1936, Vol. II, p. 310.
- 184 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1936, Vol. II, pp. 272-73.
- 185 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 12, 1936.
- 186 *Ibid.*, September 15, 1936.
- 187 *The Indian National Congress, Report of the General Secretary April-December, 1936*, p. 24.
- 188 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 28, 1936.
- 189 *Ibid.*
- 190 *Ibid.*
- 191 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1936, Vol. II, p. 7.
- 192 *The Star of India*, September 30, 1936.
- 193 *Ibid.*, October 3, 1936.
- 194 *Ibid.*, October 16, 1936.
- 195 *Ibid.*, November 10, 1936.
- 196 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 21, 1937.
- 197 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1937, Vol. I, p. 4.
- 198 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 25, 1937.
- 199 *Ibid.*, September 26, 1937.
- 200 *Ibid.*, October 11, 1937.
- 201 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1937, Vol. II, p. 416.

- <sup>202</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1937, Vol. II, p. 402.
- <sup>203</sup>A. Ahmad, *Pakistan and the Middle East*, (1940), p. 162.
- <sup>204</sup>*The Times of India*, October 18, 1937.
- <sup>205</sup>*The Indian National Congress, 1936-37*, p. 15.
- <sup>206</sup>*Report of the Fifty-first Indian National Congress Haripura, 1938*, (1938), p. 199.
- <sup>207</sup>Dorothy Norman (ed), *Nehru : The First Sixty Years*, Vol. I, pp. 569-70.
- <sup>208</sup>*Forward*, August 8, 1938.
- <sup>209</sup>*The Star of India*, August 27, 1938.
- <sup>210</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. II, p. 354.
- <sup>211</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 12, 1938.
- <sup>212</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. II, p. 354.
- <sup>213</sup>*Harijan*, November 26, 1938.
- <sup>214</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>215</sup>*The Hindu*, December 17, 1938.
- <sup>216</sup>Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad (ed), *Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, pp. 72-73.
- <sup>217</sup>*The Star of India*, January 31, 1939.
- <sup>218</sup>*Ibid.*, February 9, 1939.
- <sup>219</sup>*Ibid.*, February 15, 1939.
- <sup>220</sup>*Ibid.*, February 16, 1939.
- <sup>221</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. I, p. 382.
- <sup>222</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 327.
- <sup>223</sup>*Report of the Fifty-Second Indian National Congress*, pp. 150-51.
- <sup>224</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League: From December, 1938 to March 1940*, p. 5.
- <sup>225</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. I, p. 381.
- <sup>226</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, June 15, 1939.
- <sup>227</sup>G.E. Kirk, *op. cit*, p. 188.
- <sup>228</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League: From December 1938 to March 1940*, p. 12.
- <sup>229</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 28.
- <sup>230</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1940, Vol. II, p. 249.
- <sup>231</sup>Jamil-ud Din Ahmad (ed), *op. cit*; p. 148.
- <sup>232</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From December 1938 to March 1940*, p. 49.
- <sup>233</sup>G.E. Kirk, *op. cit*; pp. 199-200.
- <sup>234</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League: From April 1941 to April 1942*, pp. 5-6.
- <sup>235</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1941, Vol. I, pp. 298-99.
- <sup>236</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From April 1941 to April 1942*, p. 21.
- <sup>237</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1941, Vol. II, p. 217.
- <sup>238</sup>*Ibid.*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 335.
- <sup>239</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 334.
- <sup>240</sup>Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad (ed), *op. cit*; pp. 301-02.
- <sup>241</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League: From April, 1942 to May, 1943*, pp. 21-22.
- <sup>242</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.
- <sup>243</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1943, Vol. II, pp. 287-88.
- <sup>244</sup>A. Ahmad, *Pakistan and the Middle East*, *op. cit*; p. 167.
- <sup>245</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1944, Vol. I, p. 210.
- <sup>246</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 215.
- <sup>247</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 217.
- <sup>248</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 245.
- <sup>249</sup>*The Indian National Congress, March 1940 to September 1946 : Being the resolutions passed by the Congress, the All India Congress Committee and the Working Committee*, (Allahabad), p. 131.
- <sup>250</sup>Nehru's Statement in Dorothy Norman, (ed), *op. cit*; p. 601.
- <sup>251</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, pp. 123-24.
- <sup>252</sup>*Records of the Twelfth Assembly, 1931*, p. 43.
- <sup>253</sup>*Records of the Special Session of Assembly, Special Supplement*, No. 101, 1932, p. 76.

- 254 *Report of the Forty-Nine Session of the Indian National Congress 1936*, p. 35.
- 255 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 11, 1937.
- 256 *Independent India*, Vol. I, No. 10, June 1937, p. 10.
- 257 *The Hindustan Times*, July 20, 1937.
- 258 *The Hindustan Times*, July 30, 1937.
- 259 *The Modern Review*, Vol. LXII, 1937, pp. 344-54.
- 260 Ram Manohar Lohia, *Congress Political and Economic Studies*, No. 9, *Indian on China*, (1938), p. 15.
- 261 *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
- 262 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 27, 1937.
- 263 *The Times of India*, September 28, 1937.
- 264 *Ibid.*
- 265 *The Hindustan Times*, October 7, 1937.
- 266 *Important Speeches and Writings of Subhas Chandra Bose, Being a Collection of Most Significant Speeches, Writings and Letters from 1927 to 1945*, p. 168.
- 267 *Congress Political and Economic Studies No. 9, India on China. op. cit.*, p. 16.
- 268 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 27, 1937.
- 269 *The Indian National Congress, 1936-37*, p. 15.
- 270 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 30, 1938.
- 271 *The Modern Review*, 1937, Vol. LXII, p. 484.
- 272 J.L. Nehru, *A Bunch of Old Letters*, 1958, a, 250.
- 273 *Ibid.*, pp. 250-52.
- 274 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. I., p. 417.
- 275 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 6, 1938.
- 276 *Ibid.*, January 10, 1938.
- 277 *Ibid.*
- 278 *Ibid.*
- 279 *Ibid.*, January 11, 1938.
- 280 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. I, p. 400.
- 281 *Report of the Fifty-First India National Congress*, pp. 198-99.
- 282 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. I, p. 393.
- 283 *The Hindu*, April 20, 1938.
- 284 Irvin S-Friedman, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
- 285 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. I, p. 49.
- 286 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, July 8, 1938.
- 287 *The Indian National Congress : The All Indian Congress Committee Foreign Department News Letter*, August 16, 1938.
- 288 Dorothy Norman (ed), *op. cit*; p. 568.
- 289 *Ibid.*, p. 572.
- 290 *Ibid.*, pp. 572-74.
- 291 *Ibid.*, p. 596.
- 292 *The Manchester Guardian*, September 8, 1938.
- 293 Irvin S. Friedman, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
- 294 *The Modern Review*, October, 1938, pp. 486-88.
- 295 *Ibid.*, July 1938, pp. 486-88.
- 296 *Ibid.*
- 297 Krishnalal Shridharni, *Warning to the West*, 1944, pp. 94-95.
- 298 *Harijan*, August 27, 1938.
- 299 *Ibid.*
- 300 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 2, 1938.
- 301 *Foreign Department News Letter*, September 15, 1938.
- 302 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1938, Vol. I, p. 420.
- 303 *Report of the Fifty-Second Indian National Congress, 1939*, pp. 84-85.
- 304 Dorothy Norman, *op. cit.* p. 574.
- 305 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. I, p. 99.

- 306 Jawahar Lal Nehru, *China, Spain and the War. Essays and Writings*, (1940), p. 20.
- 307 Irvin S. Friedman, *op. cit*; p. 20.
- 308 *Ibid.*
- 309 S.T. Hsieh, "Nehru's week in Chungking", *Asia*, Vol. XXXIX, No. II, p. 662.
- 310 B. Prasad, *The Origins of Indian Foreign Policy*, p. 140.
- 311 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1939, Vol. II, p. 229.
- 312 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 4, 1939.
- 313 B.G. Gokhale, *The Making of the Indian Nation*, 1966, p. 336.
- 314 S.T. Hsieh, *op. cit*; p. 662.
- 315 P.C. Chakravarti, *India-China Relations*, (1961), p. 6.
- 316 S.T. Hsieh, *op. cit*; p. 662.
- 317 J.L. Nehru, *China, Spain and the War*, *op. cit*; pp. 21-23.
- 318 *Ibid.*
- 319 *The Nation*, 1942, p. 411.
- 320 J.L. Nehru, *China, Spain and the War*, pp. 21-25.
- 321 J.L. Nehru, *Towards Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawahar Lal Nehru*, (1941), pp. 367-68.
- 322 J.L. Nehru, *Autobiography*, p. 608.
- 323 S.T. Hsieh, *op. cit*; p. 608.
- 324 Basil Mathews, "World wide Reactions to Events in India", *Asiatic Review*, Newseries, Vol. XXXVI, April, 1940, p. 261.
- 325 Miss Bhicoo Batlivala, "India Knows What to Expect", *Asia*, Vol. XL, July, 1940, p. 374.
- 326 J.L. Nehru, *A Bunch of Old Letters*, p. 380.
- 327 *Ibid.*, pp. 395-96.
- 328 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1940, Vol. II, p. 201.
- 329 J.L. Nehru, "India's Demand and Britain's Answer" *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1940.
- 330 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1940, Vol. II, pp. 311-12.
- 331 *All India Congress Committee, Foreign Department News Letter*, July 18, 1940.
- 332 J.L. Nehru, *A Bunch of Old Letters*, pp. 438-39.
- 333 *Ibid.*, pp. 440-41.
- 334 *Ibid.*, pp. 444-45.
- 335 Krishnalal Shridharani, *op. cit*; p. 98.
- 336 *The Hindu*, July 8, 1941.
- 337 *Ibid.*, November 9, 1941.
- 338 *Ibid.*, January, 10, 1941.
- 339 *Ibid.*, March 11, 1941.
- 340 J.L. Nehru, *Before and After Independence*, p. 197.
- 341 *Congress Bulletin*, February 5, 1942.
- 342 D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, *op. cit*; Vol. VI, pp. 51-52.
- 343 R.E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, 1948, p. 115.
- 344 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 121.
- 345 *Ibid.*, p. 131.
- 346 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, February 13, 1942.
- 347 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, pp. 206-07.
- 348 *The New York Times*, February 22, 1942.
- 349 Amba Prasad, *The India Revolt of 1942*, 1958 p. 21.
- 350 Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit*; Vol. II, p. 61.
- 351 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 347.
- 352 *Ibid.*
- 353 *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- 354 *Ibid.*, p. 306.
- 355 *Ibid.*, p. 309.
- 356 Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit*; Vol. II, p. 61.
- 357 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 121.
- 358 *The New York Times*, February 22, 1942.
- 359 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, vol. I, p. 135.

- 360 J.L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, *op. cit*; pp. 457-58.
- 361 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, March 8, 1942.
- 362 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 44.
- 363 *Ibid.*, p. 73.
- 364 *The Indian Review*, Vol. XXXXIII, 1942, p. 325.
- 365 *Ibid.*, p. 301.
- 366 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. II, p. 58.
- 367 J.C. Kundra, *Indian Foreign Policy, 1947-54*, (1955), p. 40.
- 368 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. II, p. 3.
- 369 *Harijan*, May 3, 1942.
- 370 *Ibid.*, June 7, 1942.
- 371 Nirmal Kumar Bose, *Selections from Gandhi*, pp. 179-82.
- 372 *Harijan*, June 21, 1942.
- 373 *The Times*, London June 20, 1942.
- 374 Louis Fischer, *A Week with Gandhi*, 1942, p. 32.
- 375 Satyapal & Probodh Chandra, *Sixty Years of the Congress*, 1946 p. 336.
- 376 *Harijan*, July 26, 1942.
- 377 *Ibid.*
- 378 *The India Annual Register* 1942, Vol. II, pp. 241-44.
- 379 *The Modern Review*, Vol. LXXII, 1942, p. 219.
- 380 *The Indian National Congress, March 1940 to September 1946*, *op. cit*; p. 30-33.
- 381 *The Modern Review*, Vol. II, LXXII, 1942, p. 442.
- 382 *The New York Times*, August 12, 1942.
- 383 Louis Fischer, *The Great Challenge*, (1946), p. 162.
- 384 Amba Prasad, *The Indian Revolt of 1942*, 1958, p. 115.
- 385 *The Modern Review*, Vol. LXXXI, 1942, p. 207.
- 386 *The New York Times*, August 11, 1942.
- 387 *Ibid.*
- 388 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, August 13, 1942.
- 389 *Ibid.*
- 390 *The New York Times*, August 12, 1942.
- 391 *The Indian Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. II, p. 18.
- 392 *The Hindu*, May 31, 1940.
- 393 *Ibid.*, January 13, 1943.
- 394 S. Radha Krishnan, *India and China*, 1944, p. 29.
- 395 Mam Mohan Ghosh, *op. cit*; pp. 62-63.
- 396 K.B. Vaidya, *And Now China*, 1945, pp. 16-17.
- 397 *The Hindu*, March 10, 1939.
- 398 *The Hindustan Times*, May 18, 1945.
- 399 *The Hindu*, November 2, 1945.
- 400 *The Hindustan Times*, August 8, 1945.
- 401 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, June 26, 1945.
- 402 *The Hindustan Times*, July 9, 1945.
- 403 *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 21, 1938.
- 404 J. L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 507.
- 405 Kiran Misra, *op. cit*; p. 157.
- 406 *Report of the Fifty-First Indian National Congress*, p. 190.
- 407 B. Prasad, *The Origins of Indian Foreign Policy*, pp. 124-25.
- 408 Werner Levi, *op. cit*; p. 24.
- 409 *The Tribune*, August 20, 1939.
- 410 Krishnalal Shridharani, *op. cit*; pp. 70-71.
- 411 *Ibid.*, p. 71.
- 412 Khwaja Ahmed Abbas, "Fascism over India", *Asia*, Vol. XXXIX, June 1939, p. 324.
- 413 *Ibid.*
- 414 Michael Edwardes, *The Last Years of British India*, p. 79.

- <sup>415</sup>Michael Edwardes, *The Last Years of British India*, p. 79.
- <sup>416</sup>J. L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, pp. 543-44.
- <sup>417</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 569-70.
- <sup>418</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, May 23, 1942.
- <sup>419</sup>Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, *India Wins Freedom*, p. 64.
- <sup>420</sup>J.S. Bright (ed), *Important Speeches and Writings of Subhas Chandra Bose*, pp. 213-320.
- <sup>421</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
- <sup>422</sup>A.C. Bose "Japanese Attitude Towards Indian Nationalism, 1941-43," *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Session of the Indian History Congress held at Varansi, 1969*, 1970, pp. 462-63.
- <sup>423</sup>Nobutake Ike, *Japan's Decision for War*, (Stanford, 1967), p. 247.
- <sup>424</sup>A.C. Bose, *op. cit.*; pp. 462-63.
- <sup>425</sup>A.C. Bose, *op. cit.*; p. 463.
- <sup>426</sup>Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, *op. cit.*; p. 374.
- <sup>427</sup>A.C. Bose, *op. cit.*; p. 463.
- <sup>428</sup>K.C. Giani, *Indian Independence Movement in East Asia*, (1947), pp. 36-37.
- <sup>429</sup>R. C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People Struggle for Freedom*, pp. 683-84.
- <sup>430</sup>Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, *op. cit.*; p. 375.
- <sup>431</sup>A.C. Chatterjee, *India's Struggle for Freedom*, pp. 20-21.
- <sup>432</sup>K.S. Giani, *op. cit.*; pp. 101-02.
- <sup>433</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>434</sup>Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, *op. cit.*; p. 376.
- <sup>435</sup>*Contemporary Japan*, March 1942, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 471.
- <sup>436</sup>*Ibid.*, April, 1942, Vol. XI, No. 4, p. 480.
- <sup>437</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 648.
- <sup>438</sup>*Ibid.*, June 1942, Vol. XI, No. 6, p. 968.
- <sup>439</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 972.
- <sup>440</sup>*Ibid.*, April 1942, Vol. XI, No. 4, pp. 504-17.
- <sup>441</sup>*Ibid.*, May 1942, Vol. XI, No. 5, pp. 685-701.
- <sup>442</sup>*Ibid.*, September 1942, Vol. XI, No. 9, pp. 685-701.
- <sup>443</sup>*Ibid.*, April 1943, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 426-37.
- <sup>444</sup>*Ibid.*, June 1943, Vol. XII, No. 6, p. 792.
- <sup>445</sup>Satyapal and Prabodh Chandra, *op. cit.*; p. 377.
- <sup>446</sup>S.A. Ayer, "The Indian Independence Movement in East Asia" Netaji Research Bureau Bulletin, Vol. II, No. I, July 1961, pp. 8-9.
- <sup>447</sup>Hugh Toye, *Subhas Chandra Bose, The Springing Tiger*, 195, pp. 83-85.
- <sup>448</sup>A.C. Chatterjee, *op. cit.*; p. 38.
- <sup>449</sup>Shah Nawaz Khan, *My Memories of I.N.A. and its Netaji*, (1946), pp. 116-18.
- <sup>450</sup>*Ibid.*, 402, A.C. Chatterjee, *op. cit.*; p. 80.
- <sup>451</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; p. 26.
- <sup>452</sup>*Ibid.*,
- <sup>453</sup>Jan Romein, *op. cit.*; p. 295.
- <sup>454</sup>Hugh Toye, *op. cit.*; pp. 83-85.
- <sup>455</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; p. 27.
- <sup>456</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1945*, Vol. II, p. 277.
- <sup>457</sup>*Ibid.*, 1946, Vol. I, pp. 269-84.
- <sup>458</sup>R. C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, p. 723.
- <sup>459</sup>A.J. Barker, *The March on Delhi*, (1963), p. 246.
- <sup>460</sup>F.C. Jones, *Japan's New Order in East Asia, 1937-45*, (1954), pp. 3-4 & p. 465.
- <sup>461</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; p. 26.
- <sup>462</sup>D.P. Singh, "Japan and the Quit India Movement". *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Session of the Indian History Congress held at Varanasi, 1969*, p. 472.
- <sup>463</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 7, 1945.

<sup>464</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 9, 1945.

<sup>465</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>466</sup>*Ibid.*, January 10, 1945.

<sup>467</sup>*Report of the Forty-Third Indian National Congress*, p. 92.

<sup>468</sup>*All-Asian Women's Conference, First Session, Lahore 19th to 25th January, 1931, 1931,*

**Preface.**

<sup>469</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>470</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>471</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 33-41.

<sup>472</sup>*Ibid.*, Appendix.

<sup>473</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>474</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>475</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 141.

<sup>476</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 165.

<sup>477</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1934, Vol. I. p. 351.*

<sup>478</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>479</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 352-53.

<sup>480</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 353.

<sup>481</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>482</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>483</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 354.

<sup>484</sup>Werner Levi, *op. cit*; p. 34.

<sup>485</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Unity of India*, p. 389.

<sup>486</sup>*The Indian National Congress : From March 1940 to September 1946*, pp. 30-33.

<sup>487</sup>*The Modern Review*, Vol. LXXII, July 1942, p. 6.

<sup>488</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1944, Vol. I, p. 210.*

<sup>489</sup>Krishnalal Shridharani, *op. cit*; p. 69.

<sup>490</sup>J.L. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 559.

<sup>491</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Before and After Independence*, p. 279.

<sup>492</sup>Krishnalal Shridharani, *op. cit*; pp. 116-20.

## **CHAPTER VI**

# **LAST PHASE OF INDIA'S FREEDOM STRUGGLE AND THE ZENITH OF INDIAN ATTEMPTS FOR ASIAN SOLIDARITY 1945-1947**

The Second World War brought Indian affairs to a crisis and as soon as the war ended, the British realised that they could no longer withstand the pressure of Indian opinion. By this time the urge for freedom became very deep and people began to feel restless. Zafrullah Khan, addressing the Commonwealth Conference in February, 1945 had rightly assessed the Indian political situation in saying that India was growing impatient of foreign rule and that the sense of disappointment and frustration was being aggravated.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile some incidents took place both in India and in Great Britain which made the Indian problem an urgent one. The general election in Great Britain resulted in the installation of a Labour Government on August 3, 1945 which wanted an early settlement of the Indian problem. The trial of the I.N.A. personnel caused nationwide resentment against the alien rule. Public sympathy in favour of the I.N.A. personnel forced the British to revise their policy towards India. Frustration and disaffection was not confined to the people alone, it caught hold of the Indian members of the Royal Navy who went on strike against untold hardships regarding pay and food and the outrageous racial discrimination. Sympathetic strikes by Indian naval personnel occurred in Karachi, Delhi, Madras and Calcutta. The Army and the Air Forces were not altogether unaffected. There was trouble in several places, though not of a serious character.<sup>2</sup>

All these events manifested the deep-rooted resentment against the British Rule and removed the very basis of the support of the armed forces upon which the British Raj in India depended. The British Government realised that changes were needed in their attitude towards India. Hence, on August 21, 1945 the British Government announced that the elections to the various legislatures would be held in the end of that year. On September 19, 1945 the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, announced that the British Government was determined to promote in conjunction with the leaders of Indian opinion, the early realisation of self-government in India and that the elections to the central and provincial legislatures were to be held during the cold weather. The announcement of the Viceroy also indicated that the British Government had also decided to convene a constitution-making body.<sup>3</sup> The elections were held in December, 1945. In the elections the Congress secured majority in Bombay, Madras, Bihar, U.P., Orissa and Central Provinces and Congress ministries were formed in these provinces. In Sindh, Assam and North-West Frontier Province

the Congress formed coalition ministry. The Muslim League formed Government in Bengal and in Punjab the Unionists, Congress and Akali Sikh formed a coalition.<sup>4</sup>

The troubles in the Royal Indian Navy and other pressing factors prompted the British Prime Minister, C.R. Atlee, and Lord Pethick Lawrence to announce in the House of Commons and the House of Lords respectively, on February 19, 1946, that the British Government had decided to send out to India a Cabinet Mission consisting of Lord Pethick Lawrence, Sir Stafford Cripps and A.V. Alexander to discuss Indian problem with leaders of various organisations in India.<sup>5</sup> On March 15, 1946, the British Prime Minister explaining the reasons for sending out the Cabinet Mission to India declared that "the tide of nationalism was running very fast in India and that it was time for clear and definite action. The Cabinet Mission was going to India in a positive mood".<sup>6</sup>

The Cabinet Mission arrived in India on March 24, 1946 and spent the first three weeks in discussions with the Governors, Premiers of provinces, party leaders, representatives of minorities, special interests and eminent Indian politicians. Having scrutinised the proposals and suggestions put forward by both the Congress and the Muslim League, the Cabinet Mission on May 16, 1946 suggested its own solutions which were as follows :

There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the foreign affairs, Defence and Communications ; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects. The Union should have an executive and a Legislature constituted from British India and States' representatives. Any question raising a major communal issue in the Legislature should require for its decision, a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities as well as a majority of all the members present and voting. All subjects other than the Union subjects and all residuary powers should vest in the Provinces. The states would retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union. Provinces should be free to form groups with Executives and Legislatures, and each group could determine the provincial subjects to be taken in common. The constitutions of the Union and of the groups should contain a provision whereby and province could, by a majority vote of its Legislative Assembly, call for a reconsideration of the terms of the constitution after an initial period of ten years and at ten yearly intervals thereafter.<sup>7</sup> Britain was to transfer power to India soon after the Indian Constituent Assembly had framed the constitution. In the meantime the administration of India was to be carried on by an Interim Government consisting of the representatives of the Indian political parties.<sup>8</sup>

The Cabinet Mission plan was appreciated by Gandhi who said that the Mission had brought something of which they had every reason to be proud.<sup>9</sup> The working of the plan depended upon the plan's acceptance by the Congress and the Muslim League which maintained vacillating policies at that critical movement of Indian history. Just after few days of the Mission's arrival in India, Jinnah had convened a convention of over four hundred members of the various legislatures in Delhi, elected on the Muslim League tickets. In a resolution, the Convention demanded a sovereign and independent state of Pakistan comprising the six provinces of

Bengal and Assam, Punjab, N.W.F. Provinces, Sindh and Baluchistan and it also demanded the setting up of two separate Constitution making bodies by the peoples of Pakistan and Hindustan.<sup>10</sup>

With the passage of time certain changes took place. On June 6, 1946 the Council of the Muslim League accepted the Cabinet Mission's proposals and authorised Jinnah to negotiate with the Viceroy in regard to the Interim Government.<sup>11</sup> On June 16, 1946, the Viceroy proposed to set upon Interim Government of 14 persons, six belonging to the Congress, five to the Muslim League, one Sikh, one Indian Christian and one Parsi.<sup>12</sup> After much higgling and bargaining, acceptances and refutations the Interim Government was formed by Nehru on September 2, 1946. Later on, in October, 1946, the Muslim League joined the Interim Government. But the Muslim League had started a new movement by observing August 16, 1946, as Direct Action Day which unleashed forces of anarchy, mass killing and Hindu-Muslim riots. This caused bitterness between the two Communities and the Congress and the Muslim League. The Interim Government could not function in a cordial atmosphere because the Congress and the Muslim League did not work as partners but as two factions.

The British Government announced its own plan on February 20, 1947. Atlee made the statement that the British Government intended to transfer power to Indian hands by a date not later than June 1948. If the Indian parties would not work out an agreed constitution by that date then the British Government would have to consider to whom it should transfer the powers of the Indian Central Government "Whether as a whole to some form of Central Government for British India, or in some areas to the existing provincial governments, or in such other way as may seem reasonable and in the best interests of the Indian people".<sup>13</sup> On the same day Atlee announced that Wavell was to be replaced by Lord Mountbatten who was sworn in as Viceroy on March 24, 1947 to complete the transfer of power to Indian hands. It would be an epic story to narrate in detail the various schemes put forward by the British Government, the Congress and the Muslim League for the solution of Indian problem and the untoward things that happened in the course of this process. Without going into those complicated affairs of this critical period of Indian history it could be said that the process of the transfer of power to Indian hands was completed on August 15, 1947, when India emerged as an independent nation, losing some portions of its territory which were constituted into a separate state to be known as Pakistan.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the long struggle for independence launched by the Indian people became successful but resulted in the very partition of the country.

During this period from 1945 to 1947 the fate of India was in the melting pot and all the energies of the leaders were mobilised with a view to attaining freedom. But, her great pre-occupations did not deter India from expressing her solidarity with Asian nations. During the last phase of its struggle for independence, India evinced keen interests in world affairs in general and in the affairs of Asia in particular. The intense love for the neighbours and the opposition to imperialism impelled the Indian nationalist leaders to view with alarm the attempts made by the Western powers to reimpose their colonial stronghold over South East Asian countries relieved temporarily by Japan from the iron grip of the Western imperialism.

The All India Congress Committee in September 1945 candidly stated that India would deeply resent any attempt to maintain the political and economic subjection of Burma, Malaya, Indochina and Indonesia. It pointed out that India would emphatically object to the use of Indian troops for the continuation of the imperialist control over South East Asia. The Congress Committee further sent its greetings to the peoples of the countries of South East Asia and expressed its deep satisfaction at the conclusion of the war which had ravaged these countries for years together. The Committee also referred to the question of Indian settlers in Burma and Malaya and hoped that the representatives of Indian, Burma and Malaya would arrive at a satisfactory settlement for the interest of their countries which had been united in fraternal bonds since time immemorial.<sup>15</sup>

Indochina and Indonesia attracted Indian public opinion on a wide scale. In both these lands the French and the Dutch were making serious attempts to reinstitute their hegemony which were highly resisted by the nationalists of these two countries. In their fight for independence Indians expressed sympathy with them. On September 24, 1945, Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit emphatically stated in New York that India's freedom could have no meaning unless Burma, Malaya and other colonial possessions were also free.<sup>16</sup> Addressing a mass meeting Sarat Chandra Bose strongly protested against the use of Indian troops in French Indochina to put down the nationalist movement there.<sup>17</sup> Asaf Ali strongly criticised the despatch of the Indian troops to Indochina and expressed solidarity with the Indo-Chinese people in their struggle against the French rule.<sup>18</sup> On September 30, 1945, P.C. Joshi, General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, issued a statement in which he characterised as outrageous the action of the Government of India in allowing Indian troops to be sent to Java to re-establish Dutch Imperial rule and criticised the imperialist powers who were trying to defame Soekarno as a Japanese agent. He appealed to all trade unions to pass resolutions condemning use of arms to destroy Indonesian people's movement for independence.<sup>19</sup> Krishan Menon, Secretary of the India League in London, in a letter to British Prime Minister protested against the use of Indian troops against the people of Indochina, Malaya and other Asiatic territories liberated from the Japanese rule.<sup>20</sup>

On October 1, 1945 a conference of the Hindu Mahasabha held at Calcutta under the Chairmanship of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee recorded its emphatic protest against the use of Indian soldiers for the suppression of freedom movements in Indochina, Malaya and Java and urged upon the Government of India to recall all Indian units that had been sent to these countries for this purpose.<sup>21</sup> On October 5, 1945, Rajendra Prasad in an interview at Calcutta, declared that quit India meant quit Asia, if India came out of Empire no other part of Asia could remain under any European power for any length of time.<sup>22</sup> Addressing a mammoth gathering of the citizens and workers of Calcutta on October 6, 1945, Mrinal Kanti Bose, President, All India Trade Union Congress, emphatically stated that the employment of Indian troops in Indochina and Java ostensibly to restore law and order but really to reimpose French and Dutch imperial rule on those countries was an outrage on Indian sentiment. Expressing his sympathy for both the Indo-Chinese and the Indonesian people, Bose declared that had India been free, she would have sent troops no doubt to these countries but to help these Asiatic brethren to oust their imperia-

list masters.<sup>23</sup>

Sympathy for Indo-China and Indonesia became so deep and profound in India that people belonging to every walk of life expressed their solidarity with these countries. *Quit Asia Day* was observed by the Bengal Provincial Students' Federation on October 15, 1945. "Hands off Indochina and Indonesia" was their slogan and the students demanded withdrawal of Indian troops from these places. *Quit Asia Day* was observed at Howrah, Madras, Amritsar, Gaya, Poona and other places. R.K. Khadilkar and Kamraj Nadar speaking at these celebrations appreciated the students' activities and expressed their sympathy with the nationalist movements in Indochina and Indonesia.<sup>24</sup> Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit lent her support to the freedom movements in Indochina and Indonesia.<sup>25</sup> The All India Ahrar Conference held at Amritsar in October, 1945, congratulated the Nationalists of Java and Indochina on their struggle for independence.<sup>26</sup>

To express India's solidarity with Indochina and Indonesia, the Congress president, Abul Kalam Azad, urged the Indian to observe Indonesia Day on October, 28, 1945 throughout the country. Addressing a public meeting held to celebrate South-East Asia Day at Lucknow on October 28, 1945, Nehru said that the fight for India's freedom was interlocked with the liberation movement of other Asiatic countries which were determined to achieve their independence. He, however, regretted that India was not strong enough to prevent Indian troops from crushing the spirit of independence of the people of Indonesia and Indochina.<sup>27</sup> South-East Asia Day was observed at Poona and Bombay and a resolution condemning attempts to suppress the freedom movements in Indochina and Indonesia by the French and Dutch imperialists was adopted by the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee. Kanpur and Karachi celebrated South-East Asia Day and protested against the reimposition of the colonial rule over Indochina and Indonesia and asked for the immediate withdrawal of Indian troops from these countries.<sup>28</sup> Mrs. Ammu Swaminathan, Congress candidate for the Central Assembly election for the Madras city constituency, presiding over a public meeting at Madras on October 26, 1945, strongly protested against the use of Indian troops against the freedom movements in Java, Indonesia and in other Asian countries.<sup>29</sup> In a message to students read at a meeting of the Delhi Provincial Students' Federation held at New Delhi in October 30, 1945, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu stated that it was the paramount duty of the younger generation to work with united purpose for the realisation of India's destiny which would ensure the destiny of free Indonesia and Indochina and other sister lands. The meeting condemned the use of Indian troops against the freedom movements in Indochina and Indonesia and congratulated Indian Seamen and dockers in Australia for refusing to load Dutch Ships carrying arms and ammunitions.<sup>30</sup> Addressing a mass meeting at Bombay on November 10, 1945, Nehru stated that it was a matter of shame that the British Empire should be using all its might to re-establish to Dutch Empire in Indonesia.<sup>31</sup> On November 14, 1945, Indian Seamen recruited to man a Dutch Ship in Bombay harbour in place of Indonesian Seamen, refused to work.<sup>32</sup>

Mutual understanding between India and Indonesia developed to such an extent that Dr. Soekarno, leader of Indonesian nationalist movement, invited Nehru to visit Indonesia. Interviewed by a correspondent of the Associated Press of India on the

invitation extended to him by Soekarno to visit Java and inspect to conditions prevailing there, Nehru said, "I should like to tell Dr. Soekarno that if I can be of any service to the cause of Indonesian freedom, I shall gladly visit Java inspite of the urgent and important work in India. I believe that our freedom in India or Java or elsewhere hangs together and if I can serve the cause of freedom in Java now better than in India I shall certainly go there".<sup>33</sup> Sardar Patel in his letter to Nehru advised him to visit Indonesia if he got the facilities because Nehru's visit, Sardar thought, would do a lot of good to the many millions of our countrymen spread over in various parts of East Asia, apart from the good that it would do to the general cause of freedom of all Asian races.<sup>34</sup> But this visit could not take place because the British India Government did not grant the necessary facilities to Nehru. However, Nehru had deep love for Indonesia. In his letter dated October 16, 1945 to Sardar Patel, Nehru expressed his sympathy for Indonesia and said : "The Indonesian struggle is becoming more intense and critical and I feel that we ought to give it greater prominence. It would be a good thing if there were meetings etc. But the most dramatic thing would be for our dock workers and Seamen to refuse to load war material for Java, as the Australians did".<sup>35</sup>

On October 28, 1945, Nehru declared in Moradabad that the people of India will stand by the Indonesian demand for independence and will give all the help they can.<sup>36</sup> He added that the people of India resented the use of Indian troops against the national freedom movement in Indonesia.<sup>37</sup> On October 15, 1945, he had declared at Allahabad : "We must insist that no Indian troops are used against the Government of the Indonesian Republic and that no material of war is sent from India to help the Dutch Government. We must help Indonesia wherever we can."<sup>38</sup> On October 22, 1945, Nehru called for the withdrawal of British troops and for the immediate recognition of Soekarno's Provisional Government.<sup>39</sup> Maulana Azad declared on October 19, 1945, "things have come now to the point when Congress will have to consider seriously what steps to adopt to prevent the use of Indian men and material against the Asiatic peoples fighting for their freedom".<sup>40</sup> He further declared that Indians could not but sympathise with the struggle of the Indonesians.<sup>41</sup> Addressing a public meeting at Vizagapatam on November 9, 1945, H.N. Kunzru vehemently condemned the use of Indian troops in suppressing the freedom movement in Indonesia.<sup>42</sup> The Amrita Bazar Patrika in its editorial under the caption "Long Live Indonesia" expressed India's support for the Indonesian people.<sup>43</sup> The All India Congress Working Committee watched with admiration and sympathy the valiant struggle in defence of their newly won republic and independence which the people in Indonesia had been carrying on with unlimited courage and determination against British and Dutch forces. The Committee condemned the attempts to reinstitute the Dutch rule in Java and Indonesia against the declared wishes of Indonesian people and protested against the use of Indian soldiers for such purposes. The Committee also extended its sympathy and support to the nationalists in Indochina and Indonesia and expressed its resentment at the British Government's refusal to grant necessary facilities to enable Nehru to proceed to Java in response to Soekarno's invitation.<sup>44</sup>

The All India Women's Conference held at Hyderabad in December 1945 viewed with alarm the attempts to suppress the rising tide of freedom movements in

Indochina and Indonesia and protested against the use of Indian men, ships and money to annihilate the freedom movement of the East and demanded the immediate withdrawal of Indian troops from Indonesia.<sup>45</sup>

Informed public opinion in India remained always sympathetic to Indonesia and Indochina. Abdur Rahman Siddiqui in his presidential address to the All India Indonesia Conference held at Lahore on January 19, 1946 demanded that British interference in Java accompanied as it was by blood must cease forthwith. Criticising the British and Dutch policies in Indonesia Siddiqui declared, "our sympathies go out to its people as Asiatics and Muslims".<sup>46</sup> In Delhi, the Central Legislative Assembly in its meeting in January, 1946 carried a motion of censure against the Government of India for permitting the use of Indian troops in Indonesia.<sup>47</sup> Several speakers followed one another in attacking the British India Government as well as the British Government. Professor N.G. Ranga condemned the British Government for being anxious to "prop up Dutch imperialism", and for wanting to reinstate the Dutch imperialists in Indonesia. "The Indian Government", Prof. Ranga said, "has only decided to toe this line with British imperialism in order to play the game of the Imperialists".<sup>48</sup> Diwan Chaman Lall said that the British troops were not sent to Indonesia for a picnic, or for merely cooling their heels, but to suppress the Indonesian nationalist Government. He further declared, "I do not think there could be anything more shameful and disgraceful in the history of this country and in the actions of the Government than to permit Indian troops to be utilised for this purpose".<sup>49</sup> Sarat Chandra Bose said that India did not want to dip her hands in her neighbour's blood and demanded the withdrawal of Indian soldiers from Indonesia. Abdur Rahman Siddiqui said that the behaviour of the Government of India was disgraceful to the last degree, that Indian soldiers were used as, "mercenary marauders", and that the government's arguments have been placed before the members *for donkeys' ears*.<sup>50</sup> Speaking on the Censure motion on Indonesia, M.A. Jinnah, leader of the Muslim League in the Central Assembly, declared, "If my words can go to the British nation, I say that every Englishman who had a shred of honour, ought to shudder and not be party to the operations carried on brutally. You know there is universal feeling throughout India that it is a disgrace and slur upon the honour of our soldiers to be called upon to fight against a people fighting for independence."<sup>51</sup>

Sympathy for Indonesia was so universal in India that even the Bombay Naval Ratings on strike, while demanding better conditions for work, asked for the withdrawal of Indian troops from Indonesia.<sup>52</sup> On April 5, 1946, Nehru expressed disapproval of Great Britain's foreign policy, particularly in relation to Indonesia and favoured the idea of a united front of all Asian nations.<sup>53</sup> The Council of the All India Muslim League at its meeting held in Delhi on April 10, 1946 condemned the delay in the withdrawal of British troops from Indonesia and particularly the use of Indian troops for the purpose of helping the imperialist designs of the Dutch in keeping Indonesia under subjection. The Council sent greetings and congratulations to the brave Indonesian people for their heroic resistance against the Dutch imperialistic adventures and assured them of the sincere sympathy and support of the Muslims of India for their just and patriotic cause by their sacrifices for which they had raised the stature of Asia in the eyes of the world.<sup>54</sup> In Feb-

ruary 1946, the Indian Legislative Assembly passed a motion of censure against the Government of India for its failure to instruct its delegate to the United Nations to convey to the Security Council the strong view of the Assembly concerning Anglo-Dutch operations against Indonesia.<sup>55</sup> Indian Interim Government envoy at Batavia, Kundan, on March 9, 1947, told a Press Conference that the Indian Government had undertaken to reject all offers to conclude commercial treaties with the Government of the Netherland, East Indies, but was prepared to establish trade relations with the Indonesian Republican Government.<sup>56</sup>

Friendship with Indonesia was strengthened more when India suffering from serious food crisis was offered a half million tons of rice by Indonesian Republic. This good friendly gesture of Indonesia was highly appreciated by every section of the Indian people. The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress conveyed its gratitude to Dr. Shariar, Prime Minister of the Republic of Indonesia, and to the Government of the people of Indonesia for their generous offer to supply half a million tons rice to India at a time when Indonesia herself was facing serious problems and difficulties. Expressing solidarity with Indonesian people the Committee looked forward to close co-operation in the future between an independent India and an independent Indonesia.<sup>57</sup> Nehru also expressed the gratitude of the Indian people to the Indonesian Prime Minister and considered this offer of rice as the precursor of a closer friendship between India and Indonesia and expressed the hope that the people of Indonesia would emerge from its difficulties free and triumphant.<sup>58</sup>

During her freedom struggle India had been sympathetic to the national aspirations of the people of the Philippines and when the Philipinos emerged as an independent nation in July 1946, Indians shared the joys of the Philipinos on their success. On July 5, 1946, Nehru in a statement welcomed the declaration of the independence of the Philippines and conveyed the goodwishes of India to the people of the Philippines.<sup>59</sup> The Congress Working Committee in July 1946 stated that every advance of freedom in any country of Asia was welcome to the Indians and wished a bright future for the Philippines. The Committee sent its greetings to the people of the Philippines on their achievement of independence which, the Committee considered, had opened a new chapter in their history. Recalling the old ties between India and the Philippines the Committee declared that not only history, but their common interests demanded close contact between the two peoples.<sup>60</sup>

Nehru was the staunch supporter of the Indonesian people in their attempt to get rid of the Dutch Imperialists. In his broadcast on September 7, 1946, Nehru conveyed India's good wishes to the Indonesian people.<sup>61</sup> It was this intense love and fellow-feeling with Indonesian people that impelled the Interim Government of India to back up these sentiments by ordering the withdrawal of Indian troops from Indonesia and to distinguish India's policy from that of Great Britain.<sup>62</sup> In his first Press Conference at New Delhi on September 26, 1946 as Minister in Charge of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, Nehru emphatically stated that India would watch with close interest the development of events in Indonesia, Siam and Indochina. He also declared that the Interim Government was to station an Indian Consul at Bangkok and Vice-Consul at Saigon in the near

future. Expressing his good wishes for the Indonesian people and pledging to help them in every way in their task, Nehru stated : "We want them to win through and establish their freedom in Indonesia."<sup>63</sup>

The 54th annual session of the Indian National Congress held at Meerut in November 1946, sent its greetings to the Republic of Indonesia and congratulated the Indonesian people on their successes and assured them of the goodwill of the Indian people and their desire to co-operate in the fullest measure with the people of Indonesia in the promotion of the freedom and advancement of the nations and peoples of Asia.<sup>64</sup>

With the opening of the year 1947 the French imperialists made fresh vigorous attempts to reimpose their stronghold over Vietnam and to crush the Vietnamese nationalists. Indian nationalists took serious view of the Vietnamese situation, criticised the French policy and sympathised with the Vietnamese people. Much before in Delhi in January 1946 Nehru declared : "We have watched British intervention there with growing anger, shame and helplessness, that Indian troops should be used for doing Britain's dirty work against our friends who are fighting the same fight as we."<sup>65</sup> In October 1946, he sent greetings to the Ho Chi Minh, the leader of Vietnamese nationalist movement. In December 1946, he made clear to France that Indians were with Indochinese and the French attempts to crush the Indochinese nationalists had deeply hurt the Indian people.<sup>66</sup> J.B. Kripalani, the Congress President, warned France of evil consequences if Indochinese were not granted freedom.<sup>67</sup> A call to patriotic Indians to fight side by side with the Indochinese against the French troops was made by Sarat Chandra Bose at Calcutta on January 3, 1947. He further pointed out that Indochinese struggle was a part of the Asiatic struggle for liberation from Western domination ; therefore it was also India's struggle, and Indians must rush to the rescue of the Vietnamese people.<sup>68</sup> On January 4, 1947, the Congress President, J.B. Kripalani regretted that the French who valued their own freedom so high should try to deprive Vietnamese of their freedom.<sup>69</sup>

In reply to a letter from the Representative in India of the Permanent Delegation in Paris of the Vietnam Democratic Republic, Mrinal Kanti Bose, President of the All India Trade Union Congress, declared : "I have not the least doubt that Indians to a man, except perhaps the indigenous allies of the British in this country, are behind the Vietnamese in their struggle against the French who are trying to refasten their rule on the territories they had seemingly abandoned. I need hardly say that the working class of India would be happy to render active assistance to our fellow-Asiatics who have been placed almost in the same position as we have been in India."<sup>70</sup> In a message to Mai The Chau, the Vietnamese representative in India, Jinnah said : "Muslim India has full sympathy for your struggle and I wish you success in the realisation of your aspirations and freedom."<sup>71</sup> On January 7, 1947, Nehru declared that although India always had high regard for France, the attempt of France to crush the spirit of freedom in Indochina had deeply moved the Indian people who had always stood for the freedom of every part of Asia.<sup>72</sup>

Ravindra Verma, the president of the All India Students' Congress, in the course of a Press statement on January 13, 1947, made an appeal to the Interim Government of India to bring diplomatic pressure on France to recognise and res-

pect the sovereignty of the Republic of Vietnam. Conveying the greetings of the All India Students' Congress to the brave students of Vietnam, Verma declared that the Students' Congress was solidly behind the people of Vietnam in their struggle to defend the Democratic Republic against the French imperialistic aggression. He called upon the Students' Congress units all over India to observe January 21, 1947 as Vietnam Day and urged the holding of rallies and meetings on that day to explain the significance of the Vietnamese struggle and stage peaceful demonstrations before French Consulate and offices in the country.<sup>73</sup> Sarat Chandra Bose in a Press statement congratulated the All India Students' Congress on its decision to support the Vietnam forces with student volunteers and materials in their struggle against French imperialists, and appealed to the students and the general public all over the country to observe Vietnam Day on January 21, 1947 with all due solemnity and help in all possible ways to raise, train and equip an Indian Volunteers Army which would take its stand alongside the Vietnam Republican forces.<sup>74</sup> Indian Volunteers were recruited by Congress members in Pondicherry.<sup>75</sup> S.A. Dange, Vice-President of the All India Trade Union Congress, called on the docker's union to boycott French Ships calling at Indian Ports carrying troops and arms to and from Indochina.<sup>76</sup> On January 14, 1947, Mrinal Kanti Bose announced that the All India Trade Union Congress had given call to all its constituent unions, the provincial committees and the regional councils of the All India Trade Union Congress in Colombo, Calcutta, Bombay and Pondicherry to take immediate steps to boycott French transports to and from Indochina.<sup>77</sup>

To express solidarity with Indochina the students all over India observed January 21, 1947 as the Vietnam Day. Meetings and demonstrations were held, resolutions condemning the French Policy and sympathising with the Vietnamese people were passed. The girl students of Calcutta tried to stop traffic by lying down on the roads. Hand bombs were also thrown. While the students' demonstrations were passing through the College Street, Calcutta to express Indian students' support to Vietnam, the Calcutta Police arrested over 200 students.<sup>78</sup> About 80 persons were injured.<sup>79</sup> Disorders occurred in Bombay on January 23, 1947 when the forty of Subhas Bose's followers and the Communists staged a demonstration before the French Consulate, shouting slogans calling for the withdrawal of French troops from Indochina.<sup>80</sup> On January 23, 1947, Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, condemned the brutal police firing on students in Calcutta on the occasion of the celebration of the Vietnam Day and pointed out that the demonstrations were meant to show Indian solidarity with the cause of an Asiatic people struggling against European imperialism.<sup>81</sup> On February 9, 1947, Sarat Chandra Bose requested Nehru's help to send a volunteer expeditionary force and a medical mission to Indochina but this request was rejected by Nehru on the ground that it would raise international issues and the Government of India could not do that. Bose became aggrieved and retorted that his request raised no international issue and that if the Government of India, "for reasons of its own," wished to adopt a policy of non-intervention, the least it ought to do was to allow "Indian Lafayettes to proceed to Vietnam".<sup>82</sup>

It were not only the Indonesian and Indochinese freedom struggles which evoked India's interest but every Asiatic nation struggling for independence received India's sympathy and goodwill. China had to bear the brunt of war for several

years. On the termination of the war Maulana Abul Kalam Azad congratulated the people of China on their victory over Japan.<sup>83</sup> The All India Congress Committee in September 1945 conveyed its greetings to the Chinese people and expressed deep satisfaction at the end of the war which had caused them so much suffering. The Congress Committee further admired the Chinese people who had faced heroically the war for eight years and expressed the hope that the Chinese people would rise to even greater heights and build up a united and strong nation for the promotion of peace and freedom in Asia.<sup>84</sup> At a meeting of the students and teachers of Calcutta University held to felicitate China at the end of the war, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee paid eloquent tribute to the people of China who fought a lonely war against ruthless military might and observed: "A free India will march hand in hand with a free China and in that march of progress the other civilisations of Asia also must find their own place."<sup>85</sup>

In the post-war years the temporary alliance between the Nationalists and the Communists began to wither away and civil war began to disturb the unity of China. Indians viewed with deep regret and concern the civil war going on in China. The Government headed by Chiang Kai Shek and the Communists headed by Mao Tse Tung seemed to be prepared for a showdown. Some of the Indian leaders were also sympathetic to the Communists in China. Sarat Chandra Bose congratulated the Chinese Communists and regretted that the Indian National Congress leaders had never spoken a word about General Chu Teh, Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai who were the real patriots of China<sup>86</sup> and criticised Chiang Kai Shek and Madame Chiang for their policies. Though Bose's statement seemed to be the result of a clear study of China's state of affairs but the Indian leaders in general did not want to be party to the internal dissension prevailing in China. Nehru deplored Sarat Chandra Bose's remark about Chiang Kai Shek and Madame Chiang and pointed out that in this matter Sarat Bose did not represent the Congress view point. Refuting the allegation made by Sarat Bose against the two Chinese leaders, Nehru stated that to call Chiang Kai Shek a fascist was a manifest absurdity in view of all that had happened during the past eight years. He further stressed that mutual goodwill between India and China was essential for the future of Asia.<sup>87</sup> In his letter to Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Nehru referred to the statement of Sarat Chandra Bose and said that Bose's statement was likely to create unnecessary trouble. He further wrote, "None of us admires all that Chiang Kai Shek has done. But it does seem to be wrong for us to attack him in this way. He happens to be the head of the Chinese state and so far as India is concerned his attitude has always been very friendly."<sup>88</sup> Sardar Patel in his letter to Nehru also disapproved of the Bose's remark about Chiang Kai Shek.<sup>89</sup>

A development towards the closing stages of the war was the rift between the two Allies, the United States and Russia, over China policy. Russia seemed to be dissatisfied with Chiang's treatment of the Chinese Communists in the anti-Japanese coalition and America was believed to be managing to extend arms and other aid only to the Kuomintang and withholding them from the Communists. Indian public opinion saw dangers in the rift between America and Russia over China policy. *The Hindu* dated November 2, 1945 emphatically stated: "In China, as in Europe, the urgent need of the hour is for Russo-American Co-operation to help in

the pacification of the post-war world.”<sup>90</sup>

China also desired the well being of Indian people and shared the sense of achievement of the Indian nationalists in the latter's successes. When the Constituent Assembly opened its session to prepare the constitution for India, the Foreign Minister of China sent the following message :

“On the auspicious occasion of the opening of the Indian Constituent Assembly I have the honour to extend to you in the name of the National Government of China, my heartiest congratulations. I sincerely hope that your great Assembly will succeed in laying the solid foundations for a democratic and prosperous India.”<sup>91</sup>

Indians, who had been very critical of the imperialist adventures of Japan throughout her militaristic career and had supported China against Japan, showed solicitude for Japan in the post-war period. Nehru, who had been very vocal in the condemnation of Japanese policy in the pre-war and during war time, when asked by the Japanese newspapers to give a plain advice to Japan on March 27, 1946, sent a message to the Japanese people and advised them to give up the old dreams of conquest and expansion and to reject militarism and to make Japan a country of free democratic institutions. He further advised the Japanese leaders to work for gaining the goodwill of the Chinese people whom Japan had deeply injured—both materially and spiritually. “If this policy is followed by Japan”, declared Nehru, “She will not only gradually heal the deep scars of war but will also cure deeper spiritual injuries caused to herself and to others and bridge the gulf which now separates her from other nations. India and other countries of Asia will outlive yesterdays’ anger and resentment and join hands with Japan in the furtherance of Asiatic freedom and co-operation within the larger frame-work of world peace”.<sup>92</sup>

Nationalist India also looked towards Ceylon, Burma and Malaya and the Middle Eastern Countries and expressed her solidarity with the national aspirations of these countries. In a message to the Youths of Ceylon Nehru stressed the need for close collaboration between India and Ceylon. Reminding them of the close cultural, racial and religious similarity between India and Ceylon he stated that political and economic considerations must lead to a closer union between the two neighbouring nations.<sup>93</sup> The Congress Working Committee in July 1946 viewed with concern the development of the situation in Ceylon relating to the rights and security and welfare of Indians in Ceylon and urged both the Indian settlers and the Ceylonese Government to find a way for settling all disputes in a just and equitable manner and appointed a Committee headed by Nehru to obtain redress for the grievances of the Indian workers in Ceylon.<sup>94</sup> On September 27, 1946, Nehru observed that unfortunately there had been for some time past a kind of impasse with regard to India's relations with Ceylon “but we have tried to our utmost, and we propose to continue trying, to approach the people of Ceylon and the Ceylon Government in a friendly manner because it is inevitable that Ceylon and India must pull together in future and we do not want a trace of bad blood between us”.<sup>95</sup> In a press interview on September 27, 1946, Nehru declared that India would follow a very friendly policy towards Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim.<sup>96</sup>

J.B. Kripalani, the President of the fifty-fourth session of the Indian National Congress in 1946, pleaded for close and the friendly relations with Ceylon and

Burma. Expressing his fellow-feeling with these countries Kripalani observed, "Ceylon and India have been good neighbours all along and the Congress is determined to maintain and develop these relations. Indian nationals in Burma must identify themselves with the people of Burma and mix with them as sugar does with milk. Knit together in a common friendly relationship, India, Burma and Ceylon will be in a position to fulfil their historical mission in the creation of a federation of free Asiatic nations that would constitute a powerful bulwark against imperialism and exploitation whether of the Western or the Eastern type".<sup>27</sup>

India pledged her full support to Burma when the great Burmese leader Aung San visited India in January, 1947. He was accorded warm reception in India. In a statement issued on January 7, 1947, Nehru admired the leadership and heroic deeds of Aung San and wished him success in his enterprise so that Burma might attain freedom. Appreciating the Burmese leader's desire to develop friendly relations with India, Nehru declared that co-operation between India and Burma would be highly beneficial for the peace of the continent.<sup>98</sup>

Ceylonese and Burmese nationalists gave good response to India's friendly feelings for them. On September 8, 1946, M.W.H. de Silva, Ceylon Government's representative in India, wished friendly relations between India and Ceylon.<sup>99</sup> U. Saw, a Burmese leader, in a statement on December 13, 1946 expressed the hope that India would get her independence without late and an independent India would be a source of strength to Asia.<sup>100</sup> When the conflicts between the Hindus and the Muslims ravaged India and threatened the unity of the country, Aung San in a statement issued on February 15, 1947, expressed his grave concern that such conflicts would weaken India.<sup>101</sup>

India's sympathy for the Middle Eastern countries in the post Second World War period remained as intense and profound as it had been before the war. The All India Congress Committee in September, 1945 sought to develop common policies for defence, trade, economic and cultural development with the countries of the Middle East.<sup>102</sup> In his presidential address to the All Parties' Shia Conference in October, 1945, Hosseinbhoi A. Laljee expressed his indignation at the non-Muslims' control over Palestine and Hejaz and criticised the American policy in regard to the Jewish immigration in to Palestine.<sup>103</sup> The All India Ahrar Conference held at Amritsar in October, 1945 condemned the attitude of the British and American Governments in letting Jews make an encroachment upon the rights of the Arabs in Palestine.<sup>104</sup> Maulana Abul Kalam Azad warned the Americans and British to keep their hands off Palestine. "Indian public opinion", Azad declared, "is solidly with the Arabs of Palestine and if the British take any stand detrimental to the Arabs, they will greatly resent it".<sup>105</sup> He further stated that the suggestion to divide Palestine into Arab and Jewish states was thoroughly impracticable and gravely unjust.<sup>106</sup> The Council of Action of the All Parties Shia Conference in December, 1945 deplored the interference of foreign powers in Iran and demanded the withdrawal of foreign military forces from Iran.<sup>107</sup>

The Congress Working Committee in March, 1946 demanded the withdrawal of foreign armies from Iran and Egypt.<sup>108</sup> On March 15, 1946, Nehru declared in Bombay that Indian opinion, as a whole, would strongly resent any aggression on Iran or Turkey by any power.<sup>109</sup>

India's friendly feelings for Arab countries awakened a similar feeling in the Arab leaders. Attiya, who was in-charge of the Arab office in Britain, told the pressmen : "We have complete sympathy with the Indian struggle for liberation. We recognise the Indian National Congress as the leader of the struggle representing both Hindus and Muslims."<sup>110</sup> He further stated that of course, the Muslims in Arab countries had spiritual affinity with the Muslims in India but this did not mean support for Pakistan.<sup>111</sup>

To solve the Palestine issue a joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry was set up which produced a report in May, 1946 and turned down the proposal for partition in favour of continuation of the mandate until the hostility between Jews and Arabs disappeared. 10,000,00 immigration certificates were to be granted for the Jews. Land transfer regulations were replaced by the free purchase and lease of lands. The report was criticised by the Arabs because it introduced modifications in favour of the Zionists. On July 31, 1946, the Anglo-American experts produced a Federation plan for dividing Palestine into two autonomous provinces, Arab and Jewish.<sup>112</sup>

Indians also resented against the pro-Jewish policy adopted by Great Britain and the United States. The Council of the All India Muslim League in April, 1946 noted with dismay the reported news that the Joint Anglo-American Commission of Enquiry had recommended the admission of 10,00,000 Jews into Palestine and the partition of Palestine for the purpose of establishing a Jewish national home. Expressing its sympathy and support for the Arabs and assuring them of all possible help in their hour of trial, the Council of the League warned the British Government that any attempt to betray the promises given to the Arabs of Palestine and Muslims of India and any arbitrary award by the British Government would be regarded by the Muslims of India as a breach of faith with the Muslim world and would result in grave consequences to the peace of all countries inhabited by the Muslims.<sup>113</sup> The Working Committee of the All India Muslim League in May, 1946 called upon the British Government to reject the recommendations of the Anglo-American Commission of Enquiry.<sup>114</sup> Criticising the recommendations of the Anglo-American Commission of Enquiry and expressing India's sympathy with the Arabs in Palestine, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, declared that the report of the Commission had caused widespread discontent throughout the Middle East and suggested that the rightful solution of the Palestine problem was the recognition of Palestine as the homeland of the Arabs and Jews who lived there.<sup>115</sup> To express India's solidarity with the Palestine Arabs, Palestine Day was observed at Nagpur on May 10, 1946 and ten thousand Muslim workers stayed away from normal work in textile mills in sympathy with the Arabs in Palestine. The report of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine was condemned at Bombay. Female members of the Calcutta Muslim League passed resolutions against the report of the Commission. Assam Muslim Association also condemned the recommendations of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine.<sup>116</sup> The Working Committee of the All India Muslim League in August, 1946 deplored the attitude of the British Government towards Palestine issue and expressed its resentment at the recommendations made by the Anglo-American Commission to dump down 10,00,000 more Jews in Palestine and viewed with alarm the various reports suggesting the parti-

tioning of Palestine into Arab and Jewish divisions. The Committee further assured the Arab League, which had taken up the matter of Palestine in its hands, and particularly the Arab Higher Committee and its Chairman, that Muslim India would stand by them and would extend all support possible in securing Palestine free from British clutches and putting a stop to the onslaught of the Jewry backed up by the United States.<sup>117</sup>

As the Vice-President in the Interim Government of India, Nehru declared that India would establish contact with all the neighbouring countries of Asia. "Towards this end", he said, "it was proposed to despatch a Goodwill Mission to the Middle East".<sup>118</sup> Abdur Rahman Siddiqi, a member of the Muslim League, who was an unofficial observer at the Palestine Conference, issued a statement on January 29, 1947 at London supporting the Arab attitude over Palestine. He warned the British Government that an anti-Arab decision by the British Government on the Palestine question might produce unfavourable reactions among the Muslim population of India.<sup>119</sup>

Not content with developing bilateral relations with the nations of Asia, the Indian National Movement during the last phase of its struggle emphatically urged the formation of an Asiatic Federation or some sort of union of the nations of the Asian continent in which India was to occupy an important position. The All India Congress Committee in September, 1945 declared that Free India would seek close association with her neighbouring countries, and would favour the formation of common policies for defence, trade, economic and cultural growth with China, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Ceylon and the countries belonging to the Middle East.<sup>120</sup> On September 9, 1945, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee envisaged a federation of Asiatic nations in which India and China were to play dominant role.<sup>121</sup> Speaking at Bombay on September 24, 1945, Sarat Chandra Bose declared that the ideal of a World Federation was impossible unless it was preceded by a federation of free Asiatic nations.<sup>122</sup> On October 31, 1945, the Congress President, Maulana Azad welcomed the suggestion of the great Burmese nationalist, Aung San, for holding a South Asiatic Countries' Conference and added that India would seem to be a natural venue for such a conference.<sup>123</sup> Asaf Ali also welcomed the suggestion of Aung San for a Conference of subject Asiatic nations and went to the length of suggesting that a Conference of the representatives of all Asiatic Countries should be held in India to consider post war developments all over the world.<sup>124</sup>

In its Election Manifesto for the election to the Central Legislature, issued in December, 1945, the Congress Working Committee declared that in international affairs the Congress stood for the establishment of World Federation of free nations. Till such time as such a federation took shape, the Election Manifesto further stated, India must develop friendly relations with all nations, and particularly with her neighbours. Recalling thousands of years of India's relations with the countries of the Far East, South East and Western Asia, the Election Manifesto laid down that free India should renew those relations. Problems of Security and trends of trade also demanded closer contacts with these regions.<sup>125</sup> In an interview to the Press on January 1, 1946, Nehru explained his concept of Asian Unity and Asiatic Federation. To Nehru, Co-ordination of the various countries of Asia was not only possible, but probable. He admitted that the talk of an Asian Federation was pre-

mature but some kind of closer association between these countries of Asia was necessary for both defence and trade purposes. Until a wider international order came into existence, the oppressed and exploited nations of Asia would seek to protect themselves by holding together in so far it was practicable and presenting a joint front in the Council of the World. In his opinion, all the Asian nations were faced by more or less similar problems of defence, establishing democratic institutions, developing industry and agriculture and the uplift of the living standard of the masses. He hoped that in solving these common problems, they would gladly associate with the rest of the world and take help from them provided it did not involve any element of domination.<sup>126</sup> Speaking at Karachi on January 9, 1946, Nehru pointed out that it was difficult to organise defence of the countries to the right and to the left of India without India's co-operation and, therefore, these countries and India should come closer together for mutual protection as well as mutual trade.<sup>127</sup> On February 10, 1946, Nehru stated that days of national isolation had gone for ever and added that countries of Asia should promote close associations among themselves.<sup>128</sup> A very detailed programme of regional integration in Asia was discussed by D.S. Nag in his book entitled "Imperialism in South East Asia", published in February, 1946. Nag regarded Pan-Asiatic Federation, a need of the hour and urged all the Asiatics to jointly draw up a plan of united campaign to achieve freedom of their respective countries—to ensure a durable world peace by rooting out imperialism from the World—to achieve a stable economic equilibrium to advance the social and cultural life of more than half of humanity.<sup>129</sup>

The theme of Asiatic Federation remained a passion with the Indian leaders. On April 5, 1946, Nehru declared that old cultural ties and geographical situation of Asia made it desirable that a federation of Asiatic countries should be fostered.<sup>130</sup> On September 7, 1946, Nehru stressed the need of close association among the nations of Asia. Indians were nearer and closer to them than others. He urged the Indian people to develop close contacts with the nations of Asia and to promote a union of Asian nations.<sup>131</sup> In his article entitled "Inter-Asian Relations" published in October, 1946, Nehru reiterated his desire for an Asiatic Federation and added that since the last war, closer relations between Asian Countries had become so absolutely essential that whether the Asian Conference was summoned or not, it was bound to come and as it was bound to come Indians might as well take a lead in it because "Which ever way you look at it, India happens to be the centre of all this. Whether one talks of the Middle East, or Middle West, or South East Asia, or China, they all impinge on India; all depend on India, economically, politically and for defence purposes. They can not help looking at India and we can not help looking at them".<sup>132</sup> J.B. Kripalani in his Presidential address to the 34th Session of the Indian National Congress urged for close association between the nations of Asia.<sup>133</sup>

India's attempts to foster close relations with Asian Countries and to establish an Asiatic Federation and to bring Asia on the map of the World reached its Zenith in March-April, 1947 when India, inspite of her subjection to British Rule, summoned the Asian Relations Conference which was a landmark not only in the history of India but of the whole Asian Continent. The Asian Relations Conference was a unique event in the history of Asia in the sense that it was for the first time

in the history of this continent that the representatives of the Asian nations sat at a common table, discussed their problems which more or less the same, expressed their willingness to live in fraternal bonds and to create some sort of permanent Asian organisation to further and maintain the bonds existing among the Asian nations.

Though the Conference was convened from March 23 to April 2, 1947 the idea of convening such a Conference had been in the air immediately after the termination of the Second World War. Nehru played a dominant role in convening this Conference but even he admitted that it so happened that "We in India convened this Conference but the idea of such a conference arose simultaneously in many minds and in many countries of Asia".<sup>134</sup> The authentic report of the Conference made it clear that it was difficult to trace from the available records who first gave public expression to the general desire among Asian peoples to meet and confer together. The report further declared, "Suffice it to say that in a special interview to B. Shiva Rao, correspondent to the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Hindu* on December 25, 1945, at Allahabad, Nehru explained how an Asian Conference could be helpful to the understanding of Asian's problem and to the promotion of co-operation among Asian people".<sup>135</sup> Talking to B. Shiva Rao, Nehru expressed his desire to summon an Asian Conference for which India was to be the venue. To remove any doubt about the Conference, Nehru pointed out that such a Conference would not be against any other country either America or Soviet Russia.<sup>136</sup>

Nehru pursued the matter and when in March, 1946, he visited South East Asian Countries, he carried the concept of summoning such a Conference to them. During his stay in Malaya in March, 1946, Nehru pledged that once India was free, "every ounce of her energy shall be used for the freedom of all subject nations", and further declared that "someday, every Indian arm will be a strong arm, and those arms will fight for Asiatic freedom".<sup>137</sup> On his return, he announced that the desire for holding an Asian Conference had been expressed to him by Aung San, of Burma<sup>138</sup> and Soekarno of Indonesia.<sup>139</sup> Thereafter, Nehru influenced the Indian Council of World Affairs to take up the cause of convening an Asian Conference. The Executive Committee of the Indian Council of World Affairs accepted the proposal and began to make its efforts for the purpose. The motive behind summoning the Conference at the behest and under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs was the desire to make the Conference non-partisan and non-governmental, a Conference devoted to the study of the common problems of the Asian nations.<sup>140</sup>

Two problems dogged the organisers from the very outset. Who were to be invited? What was to be the agenda of the Conference? It was ultimately decided that all Asian countries would be invited. It was also decided to invite observers from cultural institutions in certain non-Asian countries including Australia, New Zealand, Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. Each Asian Country was to send a joint delegation of sixteen scholars, four governmental observers and individual scholars. The final agenda for the Conference was divided into five sections or groups. Group 'A' dealt with National Movements for Freedom. Group 'B' was to discuss Racial Problems and Inter-Asian Migration. Group 'C' was to

hold discussion on Economic Development and Social Services. Group 'D' discussed Cultural Problems and Group 'E' considered the Status of Women and their Problems. In the final agenda, the item concerning defence and security questions was dropped because it had more than an Asian incidence as the security and defence of Asia could not be discussed in isolation from World security and defence.<sup>141</sup>

In all 28 Asian Countries including Egypt and Soviet Asian Republics sent their representatives. Japan was not permitted by the United States Occupation Authorities in Japan to participate in the Conference and Syria, Lebanon, Trans-jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Iraq did not accept individual invitations. Observers from U.N.O., the Arab League, Institutes of International Relations from Australia, Moscow, London and New York came to attend the gathering of the Asian leaders.<sup>142</sup>

The Asian Relations Conference started its deliberations on March 23, 1947 in Delhi. To avoid the controversial issues and to maintain an atmosphere of cordiality and unanimity the Steering Committee of the Conference at its meeting on March 23, 1947, took two important decisions which provided that the Conference would not adopt resolutions but would merely accept a report representing the consensus of opinions expressed in the various discussion groups into which the Conference was to be divided. According to the second decision a Sub-Committee of fifteen persons was set up to consider the advisability of establishing a permanent institute.<sup>143</sup>

Throughout the Conference it was the Indian delegation, consisting of the prominent person from all walks of life of the nation, that dominated the Conference and was more concerned with the task of promoting solidarity among the Asian nations. Sir Sri Ram, the Chairman of the Reception Committee, pointed out that there was wide field in which all the Asian countries could work together. In all these things in which the interests of the Asian countries were similar, Sir Sri Ram called upon the delegates to co-operate together, pool their experiences, knowledge and resources for mutual benefit. He further maintained that though the Conference was not official or governmental yet the agreements or understanding which the delegates would arrive at, even if informal, and not legally binding on governments, he hoped, would not command any less weight with the Governments and peoples of the participating countries.<sup>144</sup>

Nehru, who was the guiding spirit behind this Conference, in his inaugural address to the Plenary Session of the Conference declared in an eloquent manner his deep urge for Asian solidarity and some sort of Asiatic Federation. His inaugural address began by asking "what has brought you, the men and women of Asia, here ? Why have you come from various countries of this mother continent of ours and gathered together in this ancient city of Delhi ;" and he himself replied that it was some deeper urge that brought the Asian representatives in the Conference. Speaking in the tone of a nascent Asian leader Nehru declared that Asia, which had been subjected to the imperialist control for long, was prepared to play its role in the World affairs. Explaining the objectives of the Conference, he said that the leaders of Asia were meeting in this Conference of confer together about the present and the future and lay the foundation of their mutual progress, well-being and

friendship. One of the marked characteristics of his inaugural speech was that he held the European imperialists responsible for isolating the Asian nations from one another. He, however, emphatically asserted that the artificial isolation created by the European imperialists was breaking down as the old imperialisms were fading away. The Conference represented this new move and Asian representatives were meeting at the Conference as old friends long parted. He laid stress on the inherent unity of Asia and very emphatically declared that culturally, socially and economically all the Asian countries were bound together and they faced similar and common problems. It was this inherent unity of Asia and its realisation on the part of the leaders of Asia that had made the Conference possible.<sup>145</sup>

One thing which Nehru most emphatically stressed in course of his address was the need for greater co-operation among the Asian nations and the need for Asian Federation. He said : "We have arrived at a stage in human affairs when the ideal of One World and some kind of a World Federation seem to be essential, though there are many dangers and obstacles in the way. We should work for that ideal and not for any grouping which comes in the way of this larger world group. We, therefore, support the United Nations structure which is painfully emerging from its infancy. But in order to have One World, we must also, in Asia, think of the Countries of Asia co-operating together for that larger ideal."<sup>146</sup> Considering mutual understanding and regional co-operation in Asia a step forward in the direction of the establishment of the ideal of One World, Nehru suggested the setting up of an Asian Institute for the study of common problems and a School of Asian studies. He explained that interchange of visitors and exchange of students and professors would do much to better the knowledge of one of the other and help the growth of mutual understanding between the Asian nations.<sup>147</sup>

To Nehru, the Asian Relations Conference was an event which awakened the Asians from the deep slumber they had been taking during the last two hundred years and the Conference was the proclamation of their awakening. He envisaged a new role for awakening Asia in World Affairs and said that in the hours of Crisis in World history, Asia would necessarily play a vital role. The countries of Asia could no longer be used as pawns by others, they were bound to have their own policies in world affairs. He further declared that there could be no World peace unless Asia was free and unless Asia played her part.<sup>148</sup>

In this Asian Conference and in the body that was to emerge from it, Nehru put forth the claim of India to be the centre of things in Asia. However, he played down the term leadership and said : "In this Conference and in this work there are no leaders and no followers. All countries of Asia have to meet together on an equal basis in a common task and endeavour. It is fitting that India should play her part in this new phase of Asian development. Apart from the fact that India herself is emerging into freedom and independence. She is the natural centre and focal point of the many forces at work in Asia. Geography is a compelling factor, and geographically she is so situated as to be the meeting point of Western and Northern and Eastern and South East Asia."<sup>149</sup>

While advocating regional co-operation in Asia and envisaging a dominant role in it for India. Nehru was anxious to remove the suspicion that had caught the minds of the European and American Governments that such a move aimed at

an Asiatic bloc directed against Europe and America. "We have no designs against anybody", Nehru emphatically stated, "ours is the great design of promoting peace and progress all over the World. For too long have we of Asia been petitioners in Western courts and Chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own legs and to co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us. We do not intend to be the playthings of others".<sup>150</sup>

Another Indian delegate, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, in her presidential address to the Plenary Session of the Conference referred to the inherent unity of Asia. Addressing the delegates as her *Comrades and Kindred of Asia*, Mrs. Naidu maintained that they had assembled to take an indestructible pledge of the Unity of Asia so that the world in ruin could be redeemed from sorrow, unhappiness, exploitation, misery, poverty, ignorance, disaster and death.<sup>151</sup> She urged the Asian delegates to dream a common dream and hoped that Asia would not be a continent of enemies rather she would be a continent of fellowship of the world. She further denied that the aim of the Conference was an Asiatic bloc against Europe or was a conspiracy of Asian people against Western Civilisation.<sup>152</sup>

Need for closer co-operation and mutual collaboration, which was emphasised by the Indian leaders at the Conference, was also stressed by other Asian delegates who echoed sentiments of fellow-feeling and oneness of Asia in the deliberations of the Conference. The Afghan delegate, Abdul Majid Khan, very emphatically said : "We have to live together if we are to live at all."<sup>153</sup> J. P. Dorji of Bhutan wished success to the Conference which, he hoped, was to become a symbol of love and bond of the solidarity of the Asian continent.<sup>154</sup> General Aung San, who could not be present at the Conference, in his message to the Conference conveyed greetings of the Burmese people and the Burma Government. To him, this Conference seemed to be the cornerstone of the edifice of an All-Asian Unity and solidarity and he optimistically remarked that the Conference would be guided in its task by a new consciousness of the "Oneness of Asia and also by the supreme necessity on the part of all the countries of Asia to stand together in weal or woe."<sup>155</sup> To Bandarnaike of Ceylon this Conference was only the beginning of something much greater—a federation of free and equal Asian countries.<sup>156</sup> Chang Yin-Fun, delegate from China, hoped that this Conference would enable the Asian peoples to understand one another better and this better understanding of one of the other would help the Asian nations to build on deep and firm foundations the peace and well-being of Asia and the World. To the Chinese delegate the Conference was to work as a bridge between Asia and the rest of the world.<sup>157</sup> In his message to the Conference Dr. Shutan Shariar, Prime Minister of Indonesia, expressed the hope that the Conference would exercise great influence in bringing together the governments and the people of the Asian countries.<sup>158</sup> Mai The Chau, delegate for Vietnam, was hopeful that the Conference would contribute to lasting peace, indivisible and constructive freedom and democracy and would lay the foundation of a fraternal and fruitful co-operation among the Asian peoples. In the end he warned the delegates : "We have used enough words about Asian unity. Now let us act."<sup>159</sup> Hugo Bergmann, on behalf of the Jewish delegation from Palestine, declared : "We are happy and proud to take part as old Asian peoples at this Conference and

we strive to be a loyal member of this great family of nations."<sup>160</sup> Abdur Rahman Azzam Bay, Secretary-General of the Arab League, from Cairo, associating himself with the Conference, wrote : "In the name of millions of Arabs I salute this first great Congress which demonstrates to the World the awakening of the peoples of Asia, so long held powerless to exert full moral and political influence in World affairs."<sup>161</sup> A delegate from Philippine thought that the Conference had laid the foundation of closer intercourse and lively contacts between the countries of Asia. An Iranian delegate convincingly remarked that through the tireless efforts of the Conference the Asian delegates had laid the foundation of a very durable organisation which would unite the Asians spiritually and culturally and lead the Asians to solidarity and goodwill. Sutan Shariar called upon the Asian nations to make attempts for One Asia which would, he hoped, in time expand into One World.<sup>162</sup>

After the Plenary Session the Conference split up into groups. Group A discussed National Movements for Freedom in Asia. The Chairman of Group A said that the object of the group discussion was to devise ways and means by which the various countries could win the principle of self-determination. A Ceylonese delegate stressed the need for economic freedom and urged the various countries of Asia to unite for mutual co-operation in this matter. A Chinese delegate suggested exchange of information on existing problems in various countries. An Indonesian delegate suggested that the Conference should propose the formation of an Asian Press Agency. Throughout the discussion there was a widespread urge in Asian countries to terminate foreign domination. V.K R.V. Rao and K. Santhanam from India suggested that Asia as a whole should develop the attitude that imperialism could not effectively continue to dominate any part of Asia for any length of time.<sup>163</sup>

An important feature of the group discussion was the suggestion of a Malayan delegate to form a Neutrality Bloc in Asia. Mr. Thivy, the Malayan delegate, urged upon the various Asian Countries to adopt Neutrality Bloc and refuse to assist any imperialist power by raw materials, dock-yards, arms etc. He believed that Asia could be demobilised and consequently world wars could be prevented. "A Neutrality Bloc", he declared, "was meant both to prevent assistance reaching the alien powers in their suppression of freedom struggles and to immobilise the areas covering the territories of Asia in the event of a possible world war". But the suggestion of the Malayan delegate was rejected by India, Burma and Indonesia.<sup>164</sup>

Although the suggestion for the formation of a Neutrality Bloc was rejected, the delegates from Burma, Malaya, Indonesia and other countries were one on the point that no Asian country should give any direct or indirect assistance to any colonial power in its attempt to keep any Asian country under subjection.<sup>165</sup> When Nehru said that he saw no way except moral support in which India could help other Asian nations,<sup>166</sup> a Malayan delegate bluntly said, "We do not know what you mean by moral aid. Otherwise we should go back to our countries and say—'Well, we have a vague nation that we all want to unite and fight but nothing tangible has been proposed'."<sup>167</sup> A delegate for Vietnam emphatically stated that what was needed in Asia was not a neutrality bloc but a fighting federation to protect Asian freedom.<sup>168</sup>

The discussions in Group A revealed that inspite of the repeated appeals of the Chairman for restraint, the Conference discussed political problems. India and

China came in for severe criticism by their neighbouring small countries who feared their domination. Despite all these odds, the group discussion served one purpose in helping the nations to know one another's problems and organised the pent up forces in Asia which desired an early termination of Western imperialism.

Group B of the Conference discussed Racial problems and Inter-Asian Migration. It was here that the first rift occurred in the lute of Asian unity. Burma, Malaya and Ceylon expressed their concern over the attitude of Indian and Chinese communities residing in these countries. However, the group meeting discussed the ways and means to eliminate racial conflicts and to promote understanding. The meeting suggested that there should be simple nationality law and that there should be complete religious freedom of all citizens, legal equality of all citizens, no public, social disqualification of any racial group. The discussions also urged the settlers in alien countries to work with the indigenous population and to co-operate with them in the progress of the country.<sup>169</sup>

The Group 'C' of the Conference discussed the item that related to Economic Development and Social Services. The item also included the following sub-topics, namely, transition from Colonial to National economy, Agricultural Reconstruction and Industrial Developments and Labour Problems and Social Services. Discussions on the first sub-topic revealed the deep urge among the Asian nations to unite for their economic development. A delegate for Burma proposed that Asian nations should concentrate upon a common plan for the general economic development of Asia as a whole and South East Asia in particular. Bandarnaike of Ceylon favoured the creation of regional co-operation among the nations of Asia for their economic development. Group discussions and consensus were divided. Some delegates favoured the creation of an Asiatic Bloc for economic growth of Asia. Others rejected it.<sup>170</sup> Despite this difference of approach, the discussions suggested that there should be exchange of information relating to the terms and conditions of foreign borrowing. The report said that efforts should be made for co-operation and understanding in particular regions for the planning of mutually advantageous development programmes and that the Asian nations should take concerted action to implement the policies of the international organisations.<sup>171</sup>

While discussing the problems of agricultural reconstruction and industrial development, an Indian delegate suggested that it would be very useful if an attempt was made by Asian countries to meet and discuss the continents food problem. He suggested that in this regard they could co-operate with the World Food Council. It was the general consensus that there was a great deal of room for co-operative action among the Asian nations for their scheme of agricultural reconstruction. Exchange of information and experience in regard to research, methods of cultivation, pest control and other agricultural experiences was suggested.<sup>172</sup> So far the industrial development of Asia was concerned the group discussion urged the Asian nations to co-operate with each other and to utilise the specialised agencies of the U.N.O. to realise the aim of the industrial development of Asia.<sup>173</sup>

The Group C also discussed labour problems and social services. It was agreed that there should be collection and interchange of statistics and information on labour matter in different Asian Countries. A kind of labour code for certain homogenous economic social regions was also suggested. The report of the Group

C discussions admitted that except a few regions in Asia the rest of the continent was in need of transformation in the matter of health, hygiene, housing and education. The report stated that in this matter Asian nations could learn a great deal from each other.<sup>174</sup>

The Group D discussed Cultural problems and the means and ways through which Asian nations could be brought to a common platform. The discussions were marked by Pan-Asian slant. All the delegates were proud of the cultural heritage of Asia and all of them thought of reviving that old great cultural heritage which was common to all. Furthermore, all seemed to be anxious to devise means for maintaining the cultural unity of Asia. The Group's consensus was to develop scientific and cultural co-ordination in different countries of Asia. The report suggested collaboration amongst libraries and museums, translation of classical and other significant works from one language to another, production of suitable documentary educational films of common interest, appointment of teachers of various Asian languages by the countries concerned, comparative study of Asian cultures at the universities and at the proposed school of Asian studies, consideration of the equivalence and recognition of University degrees and diplomas. The report further suggested the holding of Inter-Asian Students' Conferences, setting up of an Inter-Asian physical, cultural and educational association and of an Asian broadcasting station.<sup>175</sup>

The Group 'E' discussed the status of Women and Women's movements. The Group discussed questions relating to the position of Women, polygamy, Women's rights, status, voting right, marriage, divorce, universal adult franchise, equal opportunities for both sexes in the matters of professions, educational facilities and public services. A delegate for India suggested the formation of an organisation to maintain contacts already established among the women of Asia. It was proposed that the Asian Women's Conference be revived, that a liaison committee be established with representatives of Asian women from various countries on it.<sup>176</sup>

There was a general desire for close co-operation and the feeling of Asian solidarity was the marked characteristic of all the deliberations at the Conference. The Conference did not end simply as a debating society but started an Asian Relations Organisation with a Provisional General Council of which Nehru was chosen as the President. The proposal for the creation of an Asian Relations Organisation was promoted by the belief of the Asian nations that the peace of the world, to be real and enduring, must be linked up with the freedom and well-being of the peoples of Asia. It was 'therefore' realised that the Conference must be maintained and strengthened and the work begun at the Conference continued, efficiently organised and effectively developed. The Objectives laid down for the Asian Relations Organisation were to promote the study and understanding of Asian problems and relations in their Asian and World aspect, to foster friendly relations and co-operation among the peoples of Asia and between them and the rest of the world, and to further the progress and well-being of the peoples of Asia.<sup>177</sup>

The Asian Relations Organisation was to consist of national units, one in each Asian Country affiliated to the organisation. The units were to be non-governmental in character and were to devote themselves to the study of Asian and international affairs. They were not to have party affiliations nor they were to engage in political propaganda. The work of the Organisation was to be carried out in

the countries concerned through their respective national units. It was also decided that the next Conference would be held in China in 1949.<sup>178</sup> Thus, the Conference came to a close with a happy result which was the creation of the Asian Relations Organisation which was to usher in a new era of mutual co-operation, friendly relations, cultural fellowship, and close collaboration among the nations of the Asian continent.

The Asian Relations Conference ended with high hopes and a good deal of future promises. But behind the apparent successes of the Conference there flowed the currents of discontent, discord, mutual distrust and bickering which were to undermine the very significance of the Conference and the unity of Asia which had been repeatedly proclaimed at the Conference. The Conference could not come up to the expectations and the high hopes it had aroused in the bosoms of the Asian peoples. It exposed several grim facts which stood in the way of Asian unity for which the Conference was summoned. Why the Asian nations, who had spoken so much of Asian unity, had considered this Conference a land-mark and had laboured hard to develop close ties for mutual benefit failed to achieve their objectives at the very first Conference? The reasons were numerous and of various sorts. The Conference was not representative in character in the fullest sense of the term. Proceedings of the Conference indicated that it was a South and South East Asian Conference. The Conference was a sort drama in which the actors did not represent the tastes of the audience, they represented their selves and tastes. Japan which had been a powerful factor in the making of the history of the continent was not represented at the Conference. The Arab World was more or less unrepresented, except few observers. Furthermore, the delegations in most cases were representatives neither of the masses of Asia nor even of all the top layer of informed opinion among their own countrymen. This was due in part to the haphazard way in which the invitations were issued and in part to the reasons, known and unknown, that kept many from accepting.<sup>179</sup>

A strong protest against the composition of the Vietnamese delegation attending the Conference was made by Mai The Chau, Vietnam representative in India, who said that the three Indochinese delegates sent by the French colonists to attend the Conference represented no body but their French masters.<sup>180</sup> Even the Chinese delegation was not fully representative of the national character because it did not contain even a single representative of the Communist party which had become a powerful factor in China by that time.<sup>181</sup> Mustafa Momin, leader of the Muslim Brotherhood and Egyptian Observer to the Conference, questioned the representative character of the Palestine delegation because it actually represented Jewish population and the Arabs of Palestine were unrepresented at the Conference.<sup>182</sup> Probably the least representative of their national life were the delegates from Malaya.<sup>183</sup> Therefore, the suggestions of the Conference, which did not fully represent the informed opinion in Asian countries, could not have enduring impact on the future relations of the Asian nations and the purpose of the Conference, which was to hold free frank discussion of the Asian problems, and to develop fraternal feelings in Asia, was defeated to a certain extent.

Another major difficulty with the Conference was the attitude the small nations of Asia adopted at the Conference. They were distrustful of their powerful neigh-

bours like India and China. Many of them were afraid that integration into some all-Asian Organisation would mean the end of their political independence before they had ever acquired it or had had the sufficient time to enjoy it. A Burmese delegate unreservedly declared that one day Burmese would be swarmed either by Indians or by the Chinese. He further declared : "Burma was between two great powers. It was terrible to be ruled by the Western power, but it was even more so to be ruled by an Asian power. Burma was naturally frightened by the possibility that British imperialism may be substituted either by an Indian or by a Chinese imperialism."<sup>184</sup> The delegates from Malaya and Ceylon supported the Burmese delegate. Naganathan of Ceylon contended that there was a natural fear of domination in the countries of South East Asia from big countries like India and China, not necessarily domination by influx of population but fear that economic domination would be a threat to nationalism in these countries.<sup>185</sup> In the very opening plenary session was witnessed the confrontation between the Arab and Jewish delegates on the issue of Palestine.<sup>186</sup> It was but natural that the Conference could not come upto the expectations as it had to work in an atmosphere of mutual distrust.

Besides this distrust among the small countries of Asia about their big neighbours, some delegations played inconspicuous role at the Conference. Indo-China's two delegations seldom crossed words. The three representatives of Vietnam used the Conference as a propaganda outlet and as a field for soliciting aid in their struggle with France, while the three representatives of Cochin China, Cambodia and Laos generally eschewed controversial discussion. Delegates from Siam, Nepal and Tibet did not play significant role at the Conference. A strange attitude was adopted by the delegates from the Philippine and Korea. The Filipinos strongly argued against widespread belief that the United States had exploited them imperially and pointed with pride to the peaceful way in which the Philippine Republic had achieved its nationhood. The Korean delegates, on the whole, seemed so overwhelmingly absorbed in the national and domestic difficulties as to appear uninterested in the problems of their fellow-Asians.<sup>187</sup>

So far the role of the Arab League States or the countries of West Asia was concerned they generally played a negative part in the discussions and even appeared not to regard themselves as Asians. This attitude of the Arab States was partly responsible for the Conference's assuming the character of a Far-Eastern rather than an all-Asian meeting. They opened their lips only when questions were discussed that might be used to ventilate their grievances against the Jews in Palestine and the British in Egypt. They appeared most unresponsive to suggestions for an Asian organisation. They seemed to have come to the Conference out of mere politeness and they desired to offend or displease neither Nehru nor the Muslim League and they were satisfied with working for their interests through the Arab League. To add further, they found themselves in an embarrassing position in which they might easily have insulted either the Indian Government or the Indian Muslims, had they taken any definite stand. Therefore, they played a role that was dubious in character and dealings.<sup>188</sup>

The Arab States' indifference towards the Conference was propelled by the attitude of the Indian Muslims towards this first gathering of the renaissance Asian leaders. The Muslim League of India had refused to participate in the Conference

because of "the so-called Asian Relations Conference which has been sponsored by the Indian Council of World Affairs, ostensibly for the purpose of fostering cultural relations between Asian countries is a thinly disguised attempt on the part of the Hindu Congress to boost itself politically as the prospective leader of Asiatic people".<sup>189</sup> The Muslim League considered it absurd and ridiculous for the Congress, which was described to be the Hindu political party, to pose as the Sole Cultural representative of this vast Sub Continent and its attempts to mislead Asiatic countries into accepting it as such was nothing short of fraud. The League claimed that the Muslims yielded to no other section of the people of India in their goodwill towards their Asian neighbours, nor were they less anxious to forge with them cultural and other ties but the League was opposed to the manner in which the Conference had been summoned and to the motives of its sponsors. The League stated that it was not the proper time to convene a Conference of the Asian nations when India was going through a period of intense communal strife. The League also declared that the leaders of the muslim countries, who had associated themselves with this Conference without ascertaining the views of Muslim India, were unwillingly doing a disservice to the Muslim cause in India at a time when the Indian Muslims were engaged in a struggle for their very existence against the "Indian Hindu Congress".<sup>190</sup>

Such sentiments were echoed by the League newspapers and the Muslims under the umbrella of the League. An article entitled "Genesis of the Asian Conference" appeared in the *Star of India*, dated March 25, 1947. In that article it was alleged that Indian delegates at the conference were the leaders of the "nascent Hindu imperialism". It was further stated that at a time when Japan was ruined, China was in the throes of a bitter Civil War, the Near and Middle East Countries lacked industrial resources and South East Asia region was underdeveloped, Indian capitalists with the support of British capital were preparing for establishing their own dominations. It urged the Middle Eastern Countries to realise the latent imperialism behind the scene of the Conference and suggested that only a federation of Pakistan and the Middle East states could effectively curb this new danger to world peace. Warning the Asian nations against what it called *Hindu Imperialism*, the article concluded: "A new imperialist beast is being let loose from its cage. It has already shown its fangs and claws. If it is not warned in time it will make a bloody mess of its own and others' liberty. The Asian Conference is only a beginning."<sup>191</sup> The *Star of India* wrote in its editorial that the Asian spirit which seemed to be the motive force behind the Congress plan was really in a very carefully camouflaged fashion the caste Hindu counterpart of the Japanese brand Pan-Asia Movement to secure the monopoly of the right to dominate Asia and exploit her markets and its vast economic resources to satisfy the greed of the Hindu capitalists, the real powers behind this organisation.<sup>192</sup> These sentiments expressed by the Muslim League and the League papers, before and during the Conference meetings, left their psychological impact on the Arab Countries. Hence the Arab countries decided not to associate themselves fully with the working and objectives of the Conference because this would have offended their co-religionists in India for which they were not prepared. Consequently, the representatives from the Muslim states of the Middle East played, no doubt, deliberately a minor and a non-committal role in the

Conference. Hence the Conference lost much of its significance for the Middle Eastern Countries.

The greatest single factor which impeded the creation of an effective Asian organisation to carry out the work of the Conference was the rivalry between India and China, which caused a rift in the lute of Asian Solidarity and it was to deepen in the years that followed. With the termination of the Second World War a new landscape emerged in Asia. China was accepted as one of the major powers, atleast by Britain and U.S.A., at Cairo Conference in 1943 and at San Francisco Conference in 1945. India, too, was emerging from her long suffering and the horizon of India seemed clear as the British had decided to hand over power to Indian hands. All these developments transformed the landscape in which the old relations between India and China seemed untenable and tended to take a new turn. It was the reason that the Chinese delegation at the Conference pursued the most interesting and involved tactics.<sup>193</sup> Chinese delegates did not appreciate or relish the presence of the Tibetan delegation at the Conference and since the Tibetan delegates scarcely participated in the discussions, the Chinese did not come in open criticism for the Tibetan. However, the Chinese protested against a map of Asia, which was displayed in the Conference Hall and in which Tibet was shown as a separate state. George Yen, who was then the Director of the European Affairs in China and who attended the Conference as an observer, complained to Nehru against the map and the map was removed.<sup>194</sup> Chinese delegates felt that through this Conference India desired to be recognised as the cultural leader of the new Asia. To this end, China was evidently opposed. It was this fear of India being recognised as the cultural leader of Asia that resulted in the over cautious attitude of the Chinese delegation. Throughout the Conference Chinese representatives lost no opportunity of saying that all nations in Asia were equal, that there was no question of leadership ; that the Conference had come into being as it were spontaneously.<sup>195</sup> But the principal task of the Chinese delegation at the Conference was to see that India did not "run away with leadership of the Conference",<sup>196</sup> and consequently they conducted a relentless backstage campaign to forestall any such eventuality. The Conference had before it the proposal to create a permanent organisation to continue the works of the Conference, to maintain the contacts forged at the Conference and to develop more intimate contacts among the peoples of Asia. "It was in regard to the character and locale of the permanent Asian organisation", wrote the observers, "that the leaders of Asia's two greatest nations locked horns".<sup>197</sup>

The first meeting of the Sub-Committee to enquire into the advisability of a permanent institute met on March 25, 1947. Whereas Indian delegation on this Sub-Committee consisted of five persons, Burma, Ceylon, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Malaya, Afghanistan, Azerbaijan and Palestine each had one member on the Sub-Committee.<sup>198</sup> From the very outset there was sharp difference of opinion as to whether any central organisation should be formed. India, Ceylon, Burma and Iran seemed in favour of the creation of a permanent organisation. The delegates from China, the Philippine and Afghanistan were opposed to it on the ground that the time was not ripe for such a development and they would have to consult their parent organisations before any commitment on this issue. The Chinese delegation suggested to wait for the more representative second Conference, which was to be held in China,

before taking any definite stand.<sup>199</sup> However, it were Nehru's constant efforts that bore fruits. An atmosphere favourable for the establishment of a permanent organisation was created when Mahatma Gandhi addressing the delegates on April 1, 1947, urged the representatives from the various Asian countries to meet yearly or once in two or three years.<sup>200</sup> It was after much labour pain that the Conference delivered the sickly child of the Asian Relations Organisation to continue the works begun at the Conference. But this permanent organisation ceased to be an effective organisation on account of the negative attitude of the Chinese who wanted to forestall the move as any organisation that would have been born of the Conference would have been dominated by India because of India's being the convenor of the Conference. Furthermore, the Chinese had no wish to be tied to an organisation in which India was predominant. Their tactics at the Conference was to keep India's status within bounds. No more did the Indians wish to surrender any power to the Chinese. They were altogether distrustful of the possibility of close political bonds with a China whose political colour and foreign political orientation were uncertain.<sup>201</sup> Countries of South East Asia and the Middle East assisted China in this conspiracy and the Arab states did not evince any real interest in the establishment of a strong, permanent Asian organisation. Actually, besides the Indians no group of delegates seemed vitally interested in establishing a permanent organisation.<sup>202</sup> Enumerating the difficulties, the Asian Relations Conference had to face in the creation of a permanent organisation to promote cultural co-operation among the Asian nations. William Henderson wrote in December 1955 : "Neither the Indians nor the Chinese were prepared to concede leadership to the other, the Arabs were uninterested and the South East Asians frankly afraid that such an agreement would mean the end of their freedom, almost before it had been won."<sup>203</sup> Thus, faced with the hostility of China, the distrust of South East Asia and the indifference of the Middle Eastern Countries, India could not erect any kind of Asian structure worthy of the name and effective in practice.

The failure of the Conference to create an Asian organisation was caused by the attitude of the delegates at the Conference who seemed to be more interested in One World than in any Asian organisation. Throughout the Conference stress was laid on the World Organisation for which the United Nations was to be utilised. Werner Levi wrote that the emphasis on One World seemed to have originated out of the dislike of any continental organisation. It was a way of saying that an all Asian organisation was not wanted. The Governments of Ceylon and Thailand echoed such sentiments. The Prime Minister of Ceylon, Senanayake, indicated that the only grouping his country wanted to join was British Commonwealth. The Government of Thailand repeatedly declared that the United Nations was the only organisation its country wanted to join. These declarations generated a suppressed enthusiasm in the breasts of the Asian leaders for an Asian organisation.<sup>204</sup> Even Nehru was heard emphasising much upon the United Nations than upon an Asian organisation.<sup>205</sup> These tendencies indicated that there was too much individualistic nationalism and not enough Asianism in the minds of the Asian leaders.

The only tangible result of the Conference, which was the Asian Relations Organisation, was a timid adventure having no future. The organisation designed to foster friendly relations and co-operation among the peoples of Asia failed to do

the either and met an early end. Reasons were the vague approach of the Asian nations. Its final form was not decided and it was to be finalised by a Council consisting of twenty-two nations which could not meet to review its final form. The Conference had decided that there would be two General-Secretaries, one Indian and one Chinese, but the Chinese was never appointed. It was also decided that the next Conference would be held in China but this did not happen. The startling changes in the Chinese mainland made it impossible for the Nanking regime to spare time and resources for such external matters. The Nanking regime was fighting a life and death struggle against the communists, who seemed to have a better future and prospect, and thus pre-occupied with her own problems China could not think of convening it. Furthermore, the Asian Relations Organisation could have been kept alive in India if Nehru had shown his enthusiasm which he had shown earlier. But the experiences at the Asian Relations Conference and the distrust of India by the Asian neighbours had made Nehru reluctant about any Asian conference. The Asian Relations Organisation had structural defects too. Long before, at the time of the Conference some observers had warned that the permanent organisation, which had no central secretariat and no clear directive and which no country but India seriously wanted, would be paralysed if the Indians failed to give it effective leadership.<sup>206</sup> Krishnalal Shridharani, an Indian Journalist, wrote that the Asian Relations Organisation was going to be a consultative body without a central secretariat. This would, he warned, result in occasional shows, but not in sustained research and exchange of information.<sup>207</sup> This was what actually happened to the Asian Relations Organisation. Actually, the Asian Relations Organisation, which had an inauspicious beginning, went to the walls due to the indifference and lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Asian nations and the ineffectiveness of the national units. However, the shadow of the Asian Relations Organisation maintained its ghostly but feeble appearance till as late as June, 1955, when the Bandung Conference finally put an end to it. Thus, the first all Asian organisation, which had started with high hopes of Asian collaboration, met an early end.

The Asian Relations Conference failed to give any concrete shape to Asian solidarity partly because the Conference had started to erect the magnificent building of Asian solidarity on a base which was not strong enough to sustain the load of such a great task. Talks of Asian solidarity partly originated from the common dislike by the Asian nations for western imperialism which was the common enemy of all the colonial peoples in Asia. But Asian Unity was not to survive if it was a unity generated by the opposition to the Western Imperialists. With the progressing achievement of independence and the gradual withdrawal of Western domination, the strongest force underlying solidarity was disappearing. Each of the independent nations was anxious to build its own future and the cold war later on drew the very stimulus of Asian solidarity. The progress had begun after the Second World War when the Soviet Union and the United States started to woo rather than attempted to dictate to Asia. These tactical strategy withdrew the reason for the existence of solidarity and they introduced an element of discord through the necessity of choosing one or the other side.<sup>208</sup>

The Asian Relations Conference attempted to build up Asian solidarity on the supposed cultural unity of Asia. But the Conference witnessed the nascent rivalries

between small and big countries of Asia. There was no reason to say that the Chinese should be considered in any way closer to the Middle Eastern Countries or the Middle Eastern Countries should be considered closer to the South East Asian nations, even though they all belonged to the Asian continent. Each country had its own tradition and cultural heritage. Asia was divided by the very influences that had made it great—its religion, its rich culture, its ancient empires. China, India, Persia and Arabia were proud of the distinct and unique history, tradition and culture, and of the contributions they had made to World civilisation and were not ready to merge them in an Asian blur which the Asian Relations Conference desired to accomplish.<sup>209</sup> Thus any attempt to integrate culturally the nations of Asia in one framework would have been like rain from the clear sky. All these proved beyond doubt that an Asian Union was impossible. Werner Levi very significantly remarked, "One merit, the Conference undoubtedly had, was to show that cannot yet be done in Asia..... The Conference marked the apex of Asian solidarity and the beginning of its decline".<sup>210</sup>

But it would be a harsh judgment and an injustice done to the Conference to dismiss it as an unworthy gathering. In spite of its failure to create any regional integration in Asia or any solid and effective permanent organisation in Asia to maintain the contacts established at the Conference and to fulfil the high hopes Asian peoples had nurtured in their hearts, the Conference registered a new note not only in the history of Asia but also in the history of the Universe. Indian writers, Press and leaders viewed the Conference as a success. "Within the limited context of its aims and objective conditions in Asia at that time", wrote B.G. Gokhale, "the Conference may be said to have been a success".<sup>211</sup> Robert Payne, a non-Asian scholar, declared: "In the history of modern revolutionary movements—the movements that change the course of events—no date could be more important than that of the Pan-Asiatic Conference held in the spring of 1947, at the invitation of Jawaharlal Nehru."<sup>212</sup>

The main value of the Conference was psychological one. It gave the first opportunity to the pent-up energy of Asia to express itself. It was the Asian Relations Conference which had for the first time given the peoples of Asia, an opportunity to get together and discuss their problems, exchange their ideas and learn from each other. In doing so, it ushered in an era of promise which in the fulness of time was to make it possible for the great continent to stand heart to heart and shoulder to shoulder in weal or woe and in defence of the rich heritage of its culture and civilisation. For several centuries Asia had been viewed with contempt by the Western beneficiaries of imperialism. The Asian Relations Conference marked the revival of the ancient glory of Asia and aroused the Asiatic consciousness to realise the significance of its role. Viewed in this sense the Asian Relations Conference might well be called Asian Renaissance Conference. The real significance of this Conference was that it was the first outward expression of the new awakening in Asia and of the need which all the Asian countries felt of coming closer to one another in the changed political atmosphere of the post-war world. The Conference gave the impression that whenever any colonial power would attempt to re-establish its power in an Asian country it would have to contend not only with the freedom movement of the country concerned, but with

a hostile public opinion of the whole of Asia which was awake to the community of interests of all countries within this great continent and the democratic aspirations of all its people. The Times, London, very realistically stated that the World had a new force to reckon with *the awakened spirit of Asia*.<sup>213</sup>

The Conference marked the end of an era of European tutelage and ushered in a new epoch in which the freedom movements of Asia were bound to triumph. Two thirds of humanity was made to move and they had set out to accomplish total freedom from all forms of dominations. Hence, like the United Nations Charter, the resolution of April 2, 1947, that created the Asian Relations Organisation, N. S. Junankar believed, would rank as an historic event.<sup>214</sup> The Conference proclaimed the rebirth of Asia in the family of nations. By recording a unanimous view that the day for imperial rule in Asia had passed, wrote Nicholas Mansergh, the Conference hastened the final day of the departure of the ancient regime. The Conference proved to be the signal of the changed political climate in Asia in which there was to be no room for political domination. Mansergh further pointed out that the Conference succeeded in creating a spirit which would make it dangerous, if not impossible, for any imperial power to try to regain, what had been lost.<sup>215</sup> Truly, the Conference marked the beginning of a new epoch and it was the outward and visible sign of Asia's new importance in world affairs. In placing on record the new status which the continent as a whole had assumed, the Conference did something both to make Asian peoples politically more self-conscious and to encourage them to play a greater part in world affairs. K. M. Panikkar took this Conference as a demonstration of the new awakened spirit of Asia. To him, the Conference was a significant and unparalleled demonstration of the political coming of age of Asia. It began as an act of faith and ended as an achievement of magnitude.<sup>216</sup> Summing up the contributions of the Conference in the promotion of Asian solidarity Panikkar wrote that even if the Conference had done nothing more than bringing the peoples of Asia together, it would have achieved something which had never been done before, but "it did more, it demonstrated to the World that Asia is back at the high table in the Hall of Nations, that the mother continent had awakened from her slumber and was ready to shoulder her burden. It was an unequivocal declaration that Asia was no longer prepared to remain in bondage or to be the cockpit of the ambitions of other powers".<sup>217</sup>

The Conference was significant in the sense that India was heavily paid by the Conference for the enterprise in convening this august gathering of the Asian leaders at a time when she was on the verge of getting independence. India's frequent endeavours to speak on behalf of Asia served India by raising her higher in the esteem of the non-Asian World. The New York Herald Tribune rightly observed : "Some years hence it may be necessary for any country adopting a major line of policy in Asia to take into consideration Indian, Chinese and Indonesian opinion, regardless of whether the policy directly affects all of them".<sup>218</sup>

But India's Asian consciousness was free from any overt ambition for acting as the leader of Asia. The allegations of the Muslim League, that India through the Conference, desired to be the leader of Asia and to boost up her image in the continent, were far from truth, for several Indian delegates including Nehru and

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu laid stress on the point that all were equals at the Conference. Nehru emphatically declared in his inaugural address : "In this Conference and in this work, there are no leaders and no followers. All countries of Asia have to meet together on an equal basis in common task and endeavour".<sup>219</sup>

There had been a tendency in certain circles to minimise the significance of this Conference because it was not an official one and hence its recommendations, it was said, would not have any influence on the governments of the Asian countries. Certainly, the Conference recommendations had no governmental sanctions behind them but the Conference attempted to build up Asian Solidarity on more sound basis than political one and the basis chosen were economic, social, cultural, psychological and geographical in nature. Relations and contacts developed on the latter grounds were always durable than the relations based on political and official parleys. The Reverend Garland Hopkins of Washington, who attended the Asian Relations Conference as a representative of the Churches Committee on International Affairs, World Council of Churches, repudiated the tendency to minimise the significance of the Conference on the ground that the delegates were not official representatives of their respective governments and said that those who were present at the Conference were workers at the grassroot level, educators, scientists, labour leaders, social workers. "In the long run", Mr. Hopkins believed, "this opinion outweighs that of Governments officials. The real importance of the Conference lies in the type of people which it is composed of".<sup>220</sup>

The Asian Relations Conference aroused mixed reactions in the capitals of the Western countries. In Europe and to a lesser extent in America, the summoning of the Conference has evoked suspicions and speculation. The Conference evoked mixed feelings—dismay and despair in the Jingo-politicians, hope and enthusiasm in the colonial peoples. For if the underdogs in the East could forge a United front, the total pressure of that would indeed be irresistible for the imperialist forces who would have to surrender to the Asian peoples' demand for freedom.<sup>221</sup> The News Chronicle of London expressed this fear and declared that a certain nervousness had been apparent in European capitals lest some conspiracy for an anti-Western bloc was being hatched.<sup>222</sup> The New York Times struck a warning that the Western World will do well to watch carefully, the Asian Relations Conference which might generate large potentialities and high fears.<sup>223</sup>

But the deliberations at the Conference made it clear that emphasis on close co-operation among Asian nations did not imply any hostility towards Europe or America. While there was much anti-imperialist feeling expressed in the speeches in the Committee of the Conference, there was hardly any anti-European feeling visible at all. In fact, the attitude towards Europe was distinctly "friendly and tolerant".<sup>224</sup> It was only after the Conference over that the New York Times reported with a sense of relief that "the Conference had striven to sidestep any discussion that might suggest that this Conference was the beginning of a Pan-Asiatic bloc against white imperialism or Whites generally. It has thereby avoided unfavourable attention from the Western World".<sup>225</sup> Quite opposite was the comment from the Soviet Union, although Asian Republics of the Soviet Union had been invited at the Conference. The Indian expert, Zhukhov, wrote after the Conference : "The fact is that the Conference in Delhi was financed among other things by

certain Indian capitalists who as a rule are not interested in the gifts of culture ..... certain circles had set as one of the secret rules of the Conference to try on a new basis the idea of Pan-Asianism and further to make precisely India as the centre of the Pan-Asiatic movements. As is well known, the imperialist Japan had formerly declared herself as the centre of Pan-Asianism. She exploited it in order of justify Japanese expansion. Now some one is dreaming of exploiting the Japanese heritage in his own interest."<sup>226</sup> This assessment of the Conference by the Soviet expert was baseless and not in keeping with the intentions, proceedings of the Conference and the role played by India at the Conference.

Furthermore, the Asian Relations Conference did not design to establish a Pan-Asian movement directed against Europe or America. By convening this Conference India did not intend to create an Asiatic Bloc against the West. It was emphasised by the various delegations including that of India that any Asian organisation resulting from the Conference would work under the larger framework of the United Nations Organisation. Nehru rightly said that the Asian peoples had no designs against anybody. Their aim was to promote peace and progress all over the World.<sup>227</sup> Several speakers referred to the ideal of One world. In his address to the closing Plenary session of the Conference held on April 2, 1947, Nehru very frankly stated, "we stand for the United Nations because therein lies some hope of World Co-operation and World Peace".<sup>228</sup>

The study of the period from 1945 to 1947 would reveal that it was a period which marked the heyday of Asian solidarity and mutual collaboration in the existing circumstances and also the apex of Indian attempts for promoting the goodwill and good neighbourly feelings among the nations of the Asian continent. During this period of two years, which followed the end of the Second World War and which preceded the birth of India as a free and sovereign member in the Family of Nations, India's efforts to arouse Asia's sense of self-respect and her rightful place among the continents without inciting racial or continental prejudices and discovering any idea of an Asiatic bloc of Pan-Asiatic movement were crowned with success. The Asian Relations Conference placed Asia on the map of the World to play an independent role and kindled a hope of bright future in the bosoms of the Asian peoples. The failure of the Conference to create an Asian Union or Asiatic Federation could not undermine the real significance of the Conference. Later attempts to develop Asian solidarity and collaboration among the nations of Asia which bore fruits at the Indonesia conference at New Delhi in 1949 and the Bandung Conference of 1955 showed that the Asian nations did not lose their hopes of Asian solidarity even when their first attempt to forge Asiatic Federation had not been so much successful. In the post Asian Relations Conference era, talks of Asian solidarity and attempts made for co-operation among Asian nations bore the imprint of the spirit generated by the Delhi Asian Relations Conference of 1947. The Conference proved to be a momentous event in the sense that it laid down the habit in the Asian nations to meet together, discuss together and think together whenever the need arose and the objectives laid down before the conference provided the ideal and pattern for the destiny makers of the Asian continent in the years that followed.

REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 77.
- <sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 285-306.
- <sup>3</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit.*; pp. 218-19.
- <sup>4</sup>R. C. Majumdar (ed), *The History and Culture of Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, pp. 724-26.
- <sup>5</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 234.
- <sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 234-35.
- <sup>7</sup>Christine Dobbin, *op. cit.*; pp. 149-50.
- <sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 147.
- <sup>9</sup>*Harijan*, May 26, 1946 (Pyarelal, *Mahatma Gandhi, The Last Phase*, Vol. I, (Ahmedabad, 1956, 58) pp. 214-15.
- <sup>10</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit.*; 246-47.
- <sup>11</sup>R.C. Majumdar (ed), *History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Freedom*, p. 740
- <sup>12</sup>Pyarelal, *op. cit.*; p. 229.
- <sup>13</sup>Quoted in B.N. Pandey, *op. cit.*; pp. 87-188.
- <sup>14</sup>V.P. Menon, *op. cit.*; pp. 206-386.
- <sup>15</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, November 1, 1945.
- <sup>16</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 17.
- <sup>17</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 30, 1945.
- <sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, October 2, 1945.
- <sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>20</sup>*The Hindustan Standard*, September 30, 1945.
- <sup>21</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 19.
- <sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, 20.
- <sup>23</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 7, 1945.
- <sup>24</sup>*The Hindustan Standard*, October 18, 1945.
- <sup>25</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 28, 1945.
- <sup>26</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 163.
- <sup>27</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, October 30, 1945.
- <sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>30</sup>*The Hindustan Standard*, November 1, 1945.
- <sup>31</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 11, 1945.
- <sup>32</sup>*The Times*, London, November 15, 1945.
- <sup>33</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Before and After Independence*, p. 377.
- <sup>34</sup>Durga Das (ed), *Sardar Patel's Correspondence*, Vol. II, p. 11.
- <sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 13.
- <sup>36</sup>*The New York Times*, October 29, 1945.
- <sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>38</sup>*The Manchester Guardian*, October 16, 1945.
- <sup>39</sup>*The New York Times*, October 23, 1945.
- <sup>40</sup>*The Manchester Guardian*, October 20, 1945.
- <sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>42</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, November 13, 1945.
- <sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>44</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, January 24, 1946.
- <sup>45</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 184.
- <sup>46</sup>*The Star of India*, January 21, 1946.
- <sup>47</sup>*The Times*, London, January 22, 1946.
- <sup>48</sup>*Parliamentary Debates*, Legislative Assembly, 1946, Vol. I, January 21, p. 68.
- <sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 73.
- <sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 73-75.

- <sup>51</sup>*The Star of India*, January 22, 1946.
- <sup>52</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. I, p. 286.
- <sup>53</sup>Nehru, *Before and After Independence*, pp. 258-59.
- <sup>54</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League. From January 1944 to December 1946*, pp. 35-36.
- <sup>55</sup>*Parliamentary Debates*, Legislative Assembly, 1946, Vol. 7, February 12, p. 827.
- <sup>56</sup>North China Daily News, March 11, 1947, cited in Ton That Thein, *India and South East Asia 1947-1960*, (Geneva, 1963), p. 90.
- <sup>57</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. II, p. 98.
- <sup>58</sup>Nehru, *Before and After Independence*, pp. 385-86.
- <sup>59</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. II, p. 4.
- <sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 104.
- <sup>61</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Independence and After : A collection of speeches*. (New York, 1950) p. 341.
- <sup>62</sup>*Asian Relations*, being Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference, p. 77.
- <sup>63</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. II, pp. 251-56.
- <sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 122.
- <sup>65</sup>*The New York Times*, January 1, 1946.
- <sup>66</sup>Quoted in Richard Adloff and Virginia Thompson, *Minority Problems in South East Asia*, (1955), pp. 131-32.
- <sup>67</sup>Quoted in Ton That Thein, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
- <sup>68</sup>*The Times*, London, January 4, 1946.
- <sup>69</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1947, Vol. I, p. 26.
- <sup>70</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 5, 1947.
- <sup>71</sup>*The Star of India*, January 7, 1947.
- <sup>72</sup>*The Times of India*, January 8, 1947.
- <sup>73</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 14, 1947.
- <sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, January 21, 1947.
- <sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, January 15, 1947.
- <sup>76</sup>*The Daily Mail*, London, January 10, 1947.
- <sup>77</sup>Cited in Ton That Thien, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
- <sup>78</sup>*The Times*, London, January 22, 1947.
- <sup>79</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1947, Vol. I, p. 29.
- <sup>80</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 30.
- <sup>81</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>82</sup>*The Statesman*, March 23, 1947.
- <sup>83</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 10.
- <sup>84</sup>*Congress Bulletin*, November, 1945.
- <sup>85</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 9, 1945.
- <sup>86</sup>*Ibid.*, September 30, 1945.
- <sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>88</sup>Durga Das (ed), *Sardar Patel's Correspondence 1945-50*, Vol. II., (1972), p. 3.
- <sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 5.
- <sup>90</sup>*The Hindu*, November 2, 1945.
- <sup>91</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. II, p. 95.
- <sup>92</sup>Nehru, *Before and After Independence*, pp. 388-89.
- <sup>93</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 69.
- <sup>94</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. II, p. 99.
- <sup>95</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 154.
- <sup>96</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 257.
- <sup>97</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 288.
- <sup>98</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January 8, 1947.
- <sup>99</sup>*The Indian Annual Register*, 1946, Vol. II, p. 25.
- <sup>100</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 55.
- <sup>101</sup>*Ibid.*, 1947, Vol. I, p. 36.

- <sup>102</sup>*The Indian National Congress, March, 1940 to September, 1946, op. cit;* p. 46.
- <sup>103</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1945, Vol. II, p. 161.*
- <sup>104</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 163.
- <sup>105</sup>*The Hindustan Standard, October 1945.*
- <sup>106</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>107</sup>*The Indian National Congress, From March, 1940 to September, 1946, op. cit;* p. 153.
- <sup>108</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1946, Vol. I, p. 44.*
- <sup>109</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 163.
- <sup>110</sup>*The Hindustan Standard, September 14, 1945.*
- <sup>111</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>112</sup>G.E. Kirk, *op. cit;* pp. 211-14.
- <sup>113</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From January, 1944 to December, 1946,*  
pp. 33-34.
- <sup>114</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.
- <sup>115</sup>*The Star of India, May 11, 1946.*
- <sup>116</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>117</sup>*Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From January, 1944 to December, 1946,*  
pp. 64-66.
- <sup>118</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1946, Vol. II, pp. 252-53.*
- <sup>119</sup>*The Star of India, January 30, 1947.*
- <sup>120</sup>*Congress Bulletin, November 1, 1945.*
- <sup>121</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika, September 9, 1945.*
- <sup>122</sup>*The Hindustan Standard, September 25, 1945.*
- <sup>123</sup>*The Indian Annual Register 1945, Vol. II, p. 24.*
- <sup>124</sup>*The Amrita Bazar Patrika, November 5, 1945.*
- <sup>125</sup>Durga Das (ed)., *Sardar Patel's Correspondence, Vol. II, p. 9.*
- <sup>126</sup>J.L. Nehru, *Before and After Independence, pp. 381-84.*
- <sup>127</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 262-63.
- <sup>128</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 364.
- <sup>129</sup>D.S. Nag, *Imperialism in South East Asia, p. 42.*
- <sup>130</sup>Nehru, *Before and After Independence, pp. 258-59.*
- <sup>131</sup>Nehru, *Independence and After, p. 341.*
- <sup>132</sup>Nehru, "Inter-Asian Relations", *India Quarterly, October 1964, Vol. II, p. 323.*
- <sup>133</sup>*The Indian Annual Register, 1946, Vol. II, pp. 287-88.*
- <sup>134</sup>*Asian Relations, being Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference, New Delhi, March-April, 1947, (1948), p. 1.*
- <sup>135</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>136</sup>*The Manchester Guardian, December 25, 1945.*
- <sup>137</sup>*The Times (London), March 20, 1946.*
- <sup>138</sup>*Asian Relations, op. cit;* p. 2.
- <sup>139</sup>G.H. Jansen, *op. cit;* p. 43.
- <sup>140</sup>*Asian Relations, op. cit;* p. 2.
- <sup>141</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>142</sup>G.H. Jansen, *op. cit;* p. 45.
- <sup>143</sup>*Asian Relations, op. cit.*
- <sup>144</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.
- <sup>145</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.
- <sup>146</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 24.
- <sup>147</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 25.
- <sup>148</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 24.
- <sup>149</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 23.
- <sup>150</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 24.
- <sup>151</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.
- <sup>152</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 29-31.
- <sup>153</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 32.

- 154 *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- 155 *Ibid.*, p. 38.
- 156 *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- 157 *Ibid.*, p. 42.
- 158 *Ibid.*, pp. 44-51.
- 159 *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- 160 *Ibid.*, pp. 56-57.
- 161 *Ibid.*, p. 248.
- 162 *Ibid.*, pp. 236-41.
- 163 *Ibid.*, pp. 71-90.
- 164 *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.
- 165 *Ibid.*, p. 81.
- 166 *Ibid.*, p. p. 77.
- 167 G.H. Jansen, *op. cit.*; p. 58.
- 168 *Asian Relations*, *op. cit.*; p. 89.
- 169 *Ibid.*, p. 96.
- 170 *Ibid.*, pp. 113-20.
- 171 *Ibid.*, p. 124.
- 172 *Ibid.*, pp. 137-50.
- 173 *Ibid.*, p. 154.
- 174 *Ibid.*, pp. 162-86.
- 175 *Ibid.*, pp. 188-203.
- 176 *Ibid.*, pp. 219-20.
- 177 *Ibid.*, p. 221.
- 178 *Ibid.*, pp. 156-57.
- 179 Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, "Asian Unity: Force or Facade", *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. XVI, 1947, p. 97.
- 180 *The Times of India*, March 22, 1947.
- 181 G.H. Jansen, *op. cit.*; p. 69.
- 182 *The Star of India*, April 4, 1947.
- 183 Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *op. cit.*; p. 98.
- 184 *Asian Relations*, *op. cit.*; p. 96.
- 185 *Ibid.*, p. 103.
- 186 *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64.
- 187 Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *op. cit.*; p. 98.
- 188 Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; p. 38.
- 189 Resolution of the Muslim League, *The New York Times*, March 20, 1947.
- 190 *Ibid.*
- 191 *The Star of India*, March 25, 1947.
- 192 *Ibid.*, March 28, 1947.
- 193 Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *op. cit.*; p. 98.
- 194 Tieh-Tseng Li, *The Historical Status of Tibet*, p. 195.
- 195 Nicholas Mansergh, "The Asian Conference" *International Affairs*, Vol. XXIII, July 1947, p. 303.
- 196 Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *op. cit.*; p. 98.
- 197 *Ibid.*
- 198 *Asian Relations*, *op. cit.*; p. 13.
- 199 *Ibid.*, p. 176.
- 200 *Ibid.*
- 201 Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; pp. 37-38.
- 202 Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *op. cit.*; pp. 98-99.
- 203 William Henderson, "Regionalism in South East Asia" *International Organisation*, November, 1955.
- 204 Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; pp. 37-39.

- <sup>205</sup> *Asian Relations*, *op. cit.*; p. 25.
- <sup>206</sup> Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *op. cit.*; p. 99.
- <sup>207</sup> *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 5, 1947.
- <sup>208</sup> Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; p. 42.
- <sup>209</sup> G.H. Jansen, *op. cit.*; p. 38.
- <sup>210</sup> Werner Levi, *op. cit.*; p. 39.
- <sup>211</sup> B.G. Gokhale, "India's Role in Asia", *International Organisation*, November 1955, p. 19.
- <sup>212</sup> Robert Payne, *The Revolt of Asia*, (New York, 1947), p. 6.
- <sup>213</sup> *The Times*, London, March 26, 1947.
- <sup>214</sup> N.S. Junankar, "Asian Relations Organisations" *United Asia*, 1948, Vol. I, p. 32.
- <sup>215</sup> Nicholas Mansergh, *op. cit.*; p. 305.
- <sup>216</sup> K.M. Panikkar, "Inter-Asian Conference", *The Hindustan Review*, Vol. LXXXI, 1947, p. 229.
- <sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.
- <sup>218</sup> Cited in the *Hindustan Standard*, April 4, 1947.
- <sup>219</sup> *Asian Relations*, *op. cit.*; p. 23.
- <sup>220</sup> *The Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 7, 1947.
- <sup>221</sup> K.M. Panikkar, "Inter-Asian Conference" *op. cit.*; 237.
- <sup>222</sup> Cited in G.H. Jansen, *op. cit.*; p. 74.
- <sup>223</sup> *The New York Times*, March 26, 1947.
- <sup>224</sup> K.M. Panikkar, "Inter-Asian Conference", *op. cit.*; p. 231.
- <sup>225</sup> *The New York Times*, April 2, 1947.
- <sup>226</sup> Cited in K.P. Karuna Karan, *India in World Affairs 1947-50*, (1952), pp. 90-91.
- <sup>227</sup> *Asian Relations*, *op. cit.*; p. 24.
- <sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 248.

## *CHAPTER VII*

# CONCLUSION

The Central idea of the book rotates around the landable efforts of the Indian nationalists and their role in the freedom struggle of other Asian nations signifying the year 1947 when India emerged as an independent nation possessing certain definite values and principles governing the workings of her foreign policy. Study of the preceding pages would also indicate that Asianism as a marked characteristic of the Indian outlook had developed since the very beginning of the national consciousness in India. Informed public opinion in India expressed fellow-feeling with Asian peoples through public statements, writings and resolutions. In fact, long before India became free, nationalist leaders of India had realised that the basic problem of India and Asia was one and the same and that India's struggle for Swaraj was a part of the liberation movement of Asian countries from Western domination. A long process of the evolution of Asian consciousness in Indian nationalist thinking had preceded the emergence of India as a sovereign state in the Family of Nations. Moreover, the Indian National Congress, the most Asian conscious political association in India, came to assume the reins of administration in independent India. It was thus in the logic of things that the traditions built up and commitments made by the Indian National Congress during the struggle for freedom influenced Free India's Asian policy. She also continued the policy of friendly co-operation with the Asian neighbours—a tendency which had emerged in the nationalist thinking from Keshab Chandra Sen to Jawaharlal Nehru.

It is interesting to note that the All India Muslim League, which had a large following among the Indian Muslims and which had also fought for the cause of the nation in its own way, came to run the administration in Pakistan and to formulate her foreign policy. Beyond doubt, the Muslim League lacked a well-knit Asian policy. Nevertheless it evinced casual interest in the affairs of the Asian countries in general and Muslim countries of the Continent in particular. Moreover, the Muslim League's attitude towards Palestine issue was identical with that of the Indian National Congress. Thus the Muslim League also left a pattern of Asian policy which governed, to an extent, the foreign policy makers in Pakistan in their approaches to the Muslim countries of Asia.

Indian leaders expressed their fellow-feeling with Asian countries by co-ordinating India's struggle for freedom with the similar movements in Asia, by championing the cause of Asia and by advocating regional integration in Asia. All the nationalist leaders in India from Keshab Chandra Sen to Gandhi and Nehru

impressed upon the people of India to get into the habit of looking at India's struggle for independence as a part of the liberation of Asia. The Indian leaders thought that India held the remedy for Asian slavery. If India became free, they believed, the whole edifice of Western imperial system in Asia would collapse like a pack of cards. Indians felt a genuine sympathy for the enslaved and exploited nations of Asia. Being the most politically conscious country among the enslaved nations of Asia India inspired the other countries of Asia in their demand for national self-determination. Especially the countries of South-East-Asia derived much inspiration from Indian National Movement and looked to India for sympathy and moral support. Leaders of Nationalist India, too, were inspired by Japan and China and the freedom struggles in other parts of Asia. Thus there was much of give and take of ideas between the national movements of India and those of the Asian countries.

Throughout the period under review the Indian National Movement pursued a policy of friendship, mutual co-operation and collaboration with the Asian neighbours. Since most of the Asian countries were under Western domination of one form or the other and had national self determination as their ideal, a sense of comradeship developed among the similarly placed Asian nations. Indian leaders thought that if national self-determination was inalienable ideal for India, it must be equally necessary for all nations suffering under foreign rule. Indian leadership was wise enough to realise that India's struggle for freedom was closely associated with the similar movements in other Asian countries. A fraternal feeling with oppressed nations of Asia emerged in India's political thinking and became the marked characteristic of India's outlook during and after her struggle for Swaraj. The practical foundation of Asian Solidarity was the common Asian opposition to Western imperialism and racial discrimination. India took the lead in forging such friendly contacts with the Asian people. Leaders of India desired to live at friendly relations with all the countries of Asia irrespective of their religious, social or political set up. But the concomitant of India's Asianism was anti-imperialism. India was eager to have good neighbourly relations with all the Asian people but her anti-imperialist attitude led to the application of ideological criteria in the assessment of the Asian nations. When Japan embarked upon an imperialist career in China, Japanese imperialist policy caused alarm to the Indian people and Japan, which had been so far popular with Indian people, began to be disliked and dubbed as deviationist engaged in unoriental activities. On the other hand, from the very beginning of the Sino-Japanese hostilities India's full sympathy was with China. Thus opposition to imperialism released the forces that united India and China against even an Oriental nation which had done much to awaken the Asian people and to explode the myth of European invincibility at the outset of the 20th Century. This tendency indicated that despite her Asianism anti-imperialism was the creed for Nationalist India. Leaders of India were opposed to imperialism whether Eastern or Western.

India's attitude towards Palestine problem reflected India's abhorrence of imperialism. Enlightened public opinion and both the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League became horrified at the cruelties perpetrated on the Jews in Europe. Despite her sympathy for the Jews India looked with disfavour or rather opposed the Jews' attempt to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine

with the assistance of the British bayonet because both the Indian National Congress and Muslim League held the identical view that Palestine was an Arab land where the transplantation of the Jewish national home was to mean the extermination of the Arabs. Enlightened public opinion in India suggested that the Jews should enjoy special privileges in Palestine which belonged to the Arabs. To the Indian people the problem of Palestine was a nationalist one, the Arabs were fighting against imperialism which backed the Jewish demand for a national home in Palestine. This approach revealed India's stubborn opposition to imperialism and India's application of the ideological criteria in the assessment of the Asian nations.

But it does not mean that India emerged independent with any bias against any Asian nation. Nationalist India was always eager to promote mutual collaboration among the Asian nations which, in the eyes of the Indian leaders, were *comrades-in-bondage*. Even the fund of goodwill for Japan did not exhaust in India though Japan was bitterly criticised for her aggressive policies in China and South East Asia during the Second World War. When Japan reached the borders of India the leaders in India stood as one man against Japan. However, there was a section of Indian population having faith in the declarations of Subhas Bose which remained sympathetic to Japan. After the Japanese surrender in August, 1945 Indian leaders expressed concern over the fate of Japanese people and asked that no harsh treatment should be meted out to Japan because Japanese people had been misguided by their rulers. India's concern for Japan's future revealed that in spite of Japan's deviation the basic solidarity between India and Japan had suffered very little. Thus, despite ideological differences a tradition of hostility to none in Asia developed in the Indian nationalist thinking.

Another feature of the Indian outlook which became more and more pronounced with the broadening of the Indian National Movement was that India was devoid of any expansionist urge. Indian leaders did not want to be instrumental in depriving other countries of freedom. They followed a policy of non-interference in the affairs of other countries. The British Government had used Indian resources in men and money to promote their trade and territory in Asia and had used Indian soldiers in suppressing the nationalist aspirations of the Asian peoples. With the growth of political consciousness in India the idea developed that Indian resources should not be employed to do the dirty work of British imperialism. From the very inception the Indian National Movement, which was devoid of any expansionist urge, opposed the British expansionist policy in Asia and asked for the withdrawal of Indian soldiers from other Asian countries stationed there to help the imperialist powers. Moreover, India did not want to interfere in the affairs of the Asian people and developed a tradition of friendship with Asian neighbours on the basis of mutual co-operation and the principle of non-interference in their affairs.

During the period under review the Indian leaders worked as spokesmen of Asia and made attempts to place Asia on the map of the world and repudiated the Western claim that Europe was and always has been superior to Asia. They also declared that Asia once again would play a determining role in future world politics.

India was not content with friendly bilateral relations with individual Asian

countries. Common problems, cultural affinity, geographical contiguity and political factors urged the Indian leaders to co-ordinate their struggle for independence with the similar movements of the other Asian countries. The desire to have friendly contacts with Asian peoples gave birth to the concept of regional integration in Asia or the concept of Asiatic Federation. Sometimes a scheme for the federation of all the Asian countries was drawn up, sometimes a scheme for the federation of countries belonging to a particular region in Asia was drawn up by the nationalist leaders of India. The Delhi Asian Relations Conference was the biggest adventure made by the Indian leaders to promote Asian solidarity. The Conference created a permanent body to carry on the task for the promotion of close contacts among the Asian countries. Though it did not, as the later years showed, work to the satisfaction of the organisers but it marked the resurgence of Asia and laid the foundation upon which the future structure of Asian solidarity was constructed in the Indonesia Conference held in 1949 and the Bandung Conference in 1955. Indian attempts taught the Statesmen of Asia to meet together, discuss together and work out their common problems.

But India's ideal of Asianism was neither the outcome of any common Pan-Asiatic doctrinaire ideology nor did it imply any hostility towards Europe or America. In the Asian Relations Conference Nehru and other Indian leaders frankly declared that the Indian attempts for Asian solidarity did not aim at the creation of a Pan-Asian movement against America or Europe. Their efforts aimed at promoting world peace and progress. It was repeatedly stated by the Indian leaders that their chief objective was the realisation of One World for which the co-operation of the Asiatics was essential. Indian leaders urged the Asiatic nations to work under the stewardship of the United Nations. In fact, India's Asianism did not favour continentalism pure and simple. In order to have One World, Indians thought that the countries of Asia should also co-operate together and that too under the umbrella of the United Nations.

In every scheme of Asiatic Federation the leaders of India stressed the pivotal position of India. Indian leaders thought that India, with vast human population, was politically and geographically so situated that she was a factor to be reckoned with in Asia. They put forth the claim of India to be a pivot in Asia but the Indians did not want to dominate over other Asian nations. During the Asian Relations Conference Indian leaders were emphatic in stating that there was no question of leader and follower in Asia. All were equal.

The traditions built up by the Indian National Movement contained in themselves certain lessons for the foreign policy makers of India. They pointed out that India's claim to speak on behalf of Asia, if unduly exhibited or if put to extreme, would be irritating to the Asian countries and would cause concern and distrust in the Asian neighbours about the intentions of India. In itself, it is a great lesson and guideline for the foreign policy makers of India. The traditions developed by the Indian National Movement and the experiences of the Indian delegates at the Asian Relations Conference revealed that more deliberations and good intentions would not suffice in forging Asian Unity and in developing solidarity among the nations of Asia. It was also made clear that in the absence of compelling interests requiring regional co-operation, the formation of regional

integration among the nations of Asia was inconceivable. Any talk of Asian Federation, or regional integration or Asian solidarity must have certain prerequisites and must be necessitated by economic, political or other compelling needs because spiritual and geographical factors and anti-Western or anti-imperialist sentiments were not sufficient for any scheme of Asian collaboration. Indian leaders and policy makers must pay heed to this bitter truth experienced by the Indian nationalist leaders.

Needless to say that international outlook of a nation changes from time to time and with the change in national interests but most of the traditions developed and evolved by the Indian National Movement are such that they do not raise dissent and their validity can not be denied at any time and in any regime. The need to promote solidarity and mutual co-operation among the nations based upon the policy of non-interference and mutual respect and to promote regional co-operation in Asia under the stewardship of the United Nations Organisation are such traditions left by the Indian National Movement that no one would overlook them. India's opposition to imperialism of whatever sort and her desire to have friendly relations with all Asian neighbours are legacies of the Indian National Movement.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **PRIMARY SOURCES**

#### **A. Unpublished Records**

1. Curzon Papers.
2. Dufferin Papers.
3. Elgin Papers.
4. Hamilton Papers.
5. Hardinge Papers.
6. Jayakar Papers.
7. Lytton Papers.
8. Minto Papers.
9. Metson Collection.
10. Ripon Papers.
11. Tyabji Papers.
12. Government of India. Home Deptt., Political, Records.
13. Government of India. Reforms Deptt., Records.
14. Government of India. Foreign Deptt. Proceedings.

#### **B. Published Documents**

1. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms. Montagu-Chelmsford Report.
2. Report of the Sedition Committee, 1918.
3. Parliamentary Debates. Legislative Assembly, 1946.
4. Banerjee, A.C. : Indian Constitutional Documents, 4 Vols., 1961.
5. Dobbin, Christine : Basic Documents in the Development of Modern India and Pakistan, 1835-47. Von Nostrand Reinhold, Co., London, 1970.
6. Gwyer, M. and Appadorai, A. : Speeches and Documents on the Indian Constitution, 1921-47, 2 Vols., Oxford, 1957.
7. Philips, C.H. : (ed). The Evolution of India and Pakistan 1858-47. Select Documents, London, 1962.
8. Mukherjee, P. : Indian Constitutional Documents. Vol. I, 1918.
9. Keith. A.B. : Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy, 2 Vols , 1922.
10. Munshi, K.M. : Indian Constitutional Documents. Vol. I, Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1967.
11. Source Material for a History of the Freedom Movement in India. Collected from Bombay Government Records.

**C. Reports, Proceedings and Publications of the Indian National Congress and other Associations and Societies.**

- All Parties Conference 1928, Report of the Committee appointed by the Conference to determine the Principles of the Constitution for India, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., 1928.
- All Asian Women's Conference. First Session. Lahore, December 19, 1930 to January 25, 1931, Bombay. The Times of India Press, 1931.
- Asian Relations : Being Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference, New Delhi, March-April, 1947. New Delhi : Asian Relations Organisation, 1948.
- Asian Relations Conference : Papers Submitted to the Asian Relations Conference. New Delhi, 1947, mimeo.
- Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.
- Prospectus of the Central Mohammedan Association of Calcutta, 1878.
- A Quarter Century of the Mohammedan Literary Society of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1889.
- Mohammedan Literary Society: Abstract of Proceedings of Meeting held in Calcutta on November 22, 1870.
- Report of the Committee of the Central Mohammedan Association for the past 5 years, Calcutta, 1885.
- Report of the Committee of the Central National Mohammedan Association for the years, 1883-84, Calcutta, 1885.
- The Rules and Objects of the National Mohammedan Association with a List of the Members, Calcutta, 1882.
- The Twelfth Annual General Meeting of the British Indian Association, February 24, 1864, Calcutta, 1864.
- Madras Mahajan Sabha : Proceedings of the Conference held on December 29 and 30, 1884, and January 1 and 2, 1885.
- Quarterly Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, 1886.
- Quarterly Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, 1884 and 1916.
- Indian Association, 1876-1952, Souvenir.
- Thacker's Directory for Bengal, North Western Provinces for 1865, Calcutta, 1865.
- Records of the Special Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations Special Supplement, No. 101, 1932.
- Records of the Twelfth Assembly of the League of Nations, 1931.
- Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From December 1938 to March 1940: Delhi, n.d.
- Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From April 1941 to April 1942. Muslim League Press, Delhi n.d.
- Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From April 1942 to May 1943. Delhi, n.d.
- Resolutions of the All India Muslim League : From January 1944 to December 1946 Delhi, n.d.
- The Indian National Congress, 1920-23. Being a collection of the Resolutions of the Congress and of the All India Congress Committee and the Working Committee of the Congress from September 1920 to December 1923. Allahabad.

**The A.I.C.C., 1924.**

**The Indian National Congress, 1924, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., 1925.**

- „ 1925, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., 1926
- „ 1926, Madras, A.I.C.C., 1927,
- „ 1927, Madras, A.I.C.C., 1928.
- „ 1928, Allahabad, A I C C., 1929.
- „ 1930-34, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., 1934.
- „ 1934-36, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., 1936.
- „ 1936-37, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., n.d.
- „ 1936-39, Allahabad, A.I.C.C., n.d.
- „ 1939-40, Allahabad, A.I C.C., n.d.

**The Indian National Congress, From March, 1940 to September, 1946 : Being the Resolutions passed by the Congress. The All India Congress Committee and the Working Committee, Allahabad, n.d.**

**The Indian National Congress: All India Congress Committee, Foreign Department News Letter, 1936-41, Allahabad. A.I.C.C. Mimeographed.**

**Congress Bulletin, 1929-31 ; 1934-42 ; 1945-47. Allahabad, A.I C.C.**

**Congress Presidential Addresses : First Series : From the Foundation to the Silver Jubilee. Second Series: From Silver to the Golden Jubilee. 2 Vols. Madras, Natesan, 1934-35.**

**Congress and War Crisis. Allahabad, A I.C.C., n.d.**

**Proceedings of the 1st Indian National Congress, held at Bombay on the 27th, 28th 29th and 30th December, 1885, 2nd ed, Madras. 1905.**

**Report of the 2nd Indian National Congress, held at Calcutta, December 1886, Calcutta, Centress Press Company n.d.**

**Report of the 3rd Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1887, London. n.d.**

**Report of the 5th Indian National Congress, held at Bombay, December 1889, Bombay. n d.**

**Report of the 6th Indian National Congress, held at Calcutta, December 1890, London. 1891.**

**Report of the 7th Indian National Congress, held at Nagpur, December 1891, London, 1892.**

**Report of the 8th Indian National Congress, held at Allahabad, December 1892, Allahabad. n.d.**

**Report of the 9th Indian National Congress, held at Lahore, December 1893, Calcutta, 1898.**

**Report of the 10th Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1894, Madras 1895.**

**Report of the 11th Indian National Congress, held at Poona December 1895, Bombay, 1898.**

**Report of the 12th Indian National Congress, held at Amraoti, December 1897, Bombay, 1898.**

**Report of the 14th Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1899.**

**Report of the 15th Indian National Congress, held at Lucknow, December 1899, Lucknow, 1900.**

- Report of the 16th Indian National Congress, held at Lahore, December 1900, Lahore, 1901.
- Report of the 17th Indian National Congress, held at Calcutta, December 1901, Calcutta, 1902.
- Report of the 18th Indian National Congress, held at Ahmedabad, December 1902, Bombay, 1902.
- Report of the 19th Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1903, Madras, 1904.
- Report of the 20th Indian National Congress, held at Bombay, December 1904, Bombay, 1905.
- Report of the 22nd Indian National Congress, held at Calcutta, December 1906, Calcutta, 1907.
- Report of the 23rd Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1908, Madras, 1909.
- Report of the 25th Indian National Congress, held at Allahabad, December 1910, Allahabad, 1911.
- Report of the 27th Indian National Congress, held at Bankipore, December 1912, Bankipore, 1913.
- Report of the 28th Indian National Congress, held at Karachi, December 1913, Karachi, n.d.
- Report of the 29th Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1914, Madras, 1915.
- Report of the 30th Indian National Congress, held at Bombay, December 1915, Bombay, 1916.
- Report of the 31st Indian National Congress, held at Lucknow, December 1916, Allahabad, 1917.
- Report of the 32nd Indian National Congress, held at Calcutta, December 1917, Calcutta, 1918.
- Report of the 33rd Indian National Congress, held at Delhi, December 1918, Delhi, 1919.
- Report of the 34th Indian National Congress, held at Amritsar, December 1919 and January 1920, Amritsar, 1920.
- Report of the 35th Indian National Congress, held at Nagpur, December 1920, Nagpur, n.d.
- Report of the 36th Indian National Congress, held at Ahmedabad, December 1921, Ahmedabad, n.d.
- Report of the 37th Indian National Congress, held at Gaya, December 1922, Patna, 1923.
- Report of the 38th Indian National Congress, held at Coconada, December 1923, Coconada, 1924.
- Report of the 40th Indian National Congress, held at Kanpur, December 1925, Madras, n.d.
- Report of the 41st Indian National Congress, held at Gauhati, December 1926, Madras, n.d.
- Report of the 42nd Indian National Congress, held at Madras, December 1927, Madras, n.d.

- Report of the 44th Annual Session, held at Lahore, December 25-31, 1929, Lahore n.d.**
- Report of the 45th Indian National Congress, Karachi, 1931, Karachi. n.d.**
- Report of the 48th Annual Session of the Indian National Congress, Bombay, October 1934, Bombay, 1934.**
- Report of the 49th Session of the Indian National Congress, Lucknow, April 1936. Allahabad, 1936.**
- Report of the 51st Indian National Congress, Haripura, 1938, Ahmedabad, 1938.**
- Report of the 52nd Indian National Congress, Tripuri, 1939, Jubbulpore, 1939.**
- Report of the 53rd Indian National Congress, Ramgarh, 1940, Ramgarh, 1940.**
- Secretaries' Report for the year 1927, Madras, 1928.**
- Annual Report of the Indian National Congress for the year 1931-32, Allahabad, n.d.**
- Report for 1933-34, Presented by the General Secretaries of the Congress, Bombay, 1934.**
- Report of the Working General Secretary, November, 1934-March 1936, Allahabad, 1936.**
- Report of the General Secretary, April-December 1936, Allahabad, n.d.**
- Report of the General Secretary, January 1937-February 1938, Allahabad, 1938.**
- Report of the General Secretary, March 1938- February, 1939, Allahabad, 1939.**
- Report of the General Secretary, March 1939- February, 1940, Allahabad, 1940.**
- Report of the General Secretaries, March 1940- October 1946, Allahabad, 1946.**
- What Congress Fights for : Being the Election Manifesto of the Indian National Congress, 1945-46, Calcutta, 1945.**
- Congress Souvenir, Ramgarh, 1940, Calcutta.**

**D. Speeches and Writings.**

- Ali, Mohammed : Selected Writings and Speeches of Maulana Mohammed Ali, ed. by Iqbal Afzal, Lahore, Ashraf, 1944.**
- Banerjee, Surendranath : Speeches of Babu Surendranath Banerjee, Calcutta, 1908.**
- Speeches and Writings of Hon : Surendranath Banerjee Selected by Himself, Madras, Natesan. n.d.**
- Bhandarkar, R.G. : Collected Works of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar, Vol. 1, Poona, 1927.**
- Bose, Subhas Chandra : Famous Speeches and Letters of Subhas Chandra Bose, ed. by Ganpat Rai, Lahore, Lion Press, 1946.**
- Important Speeches and Writings of Subhas Bose; Being a Collection of Most Significant Speeches and Writings of Subhas Bose. Ed. by J.S. Bright, Lahore, Indian Printing Works, 1946.**
- Netaji Speaks to the Nation, 1928-45. A Symposium of Important Speeches and Writings of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. Ed. by Durlab Singh, Lahore, Hero Publications, 1946.**
- On to Delhi; or Speeches and Writings of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose Ed by G. C. Jain. Delhi, 1946.**
- Chandavarker, N.G. : The Speeches and Writings of Narayan G. Chandavarker. Bombay, 1911.**
- Curzon, Lord : Lord Curzon in India—Speeches, Vol. II, Lahore, 1906.**

- Das, Chitta Ranjan : *Speeches*, Calcutta, 1918.
- Deshbandhu Chittaranjan : *Brief Survey of Life and Work, Provincial Conference Speeches, Congress Speeches*, ed. by Rajen Sen, Calcutta, 1927.
- Dufferin, Lord : *Speeches Delivered in India, (1884-1888)*, London, 1890.
- Dutt, R.C. : *Speeches and Papers on Indian Question 1901 and 1902*. Calcutta, 1904.
- Gokhale, Gopal Krishna : *Speeches of the Hon'ble G.K. Gokhale*, Madras, 1920.
- Speeches and Writings of Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, ed. by D.G. Karvae, Vol. II, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1966.
- His Life and Speeches*, ed. by John. S. Hoyland, Calcutta, 1933.
- Ghose, Aurobindo : *An Open Letter to His Countrymen*, Calcutta, 1909.
- Speeches*, Pondicherry, 1952.
- His Letters to His Wife*. Poona, 1909.
- Gandhi, M.K. : *Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, Madras, 1933.
- Freedom's Battle, Being a Comprehensive Collection of Writings and Speeches on the Present Situation*. Second ed. Madras, Ganesh, 1922.
- The Nation's Voice : Being a collection of Gandhiji's Speeches in England and Sjt. Mahadev Desai's Account of the Sojourn (September to December 1931)*, Ed. by C. Raja-Gopalachari and J. C. Kumarappa, Second ed. Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1947.
- My Appeal to the British*, ed. by Anand T. Hingorani, New York, 1942.
- Quit India*, ed. by R.K. Prabhu and U.R. Rao, Revised ed. Bombay, 1942.
- Selected Writings of Mahatma Gandhi. Selected and Introduced by Ronald Duncan*, London, Faber and Faber, 1951.
- Correspondence with the Government, 1942-44*. Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1945.
- Correspondence with Mr. Gandhi, August 1942-April 1944*. Delhi, Government of India, 1944.
- Selections from Gandhi*. Ed. by N.K. Bose, Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1948.
- Poona Statements : Statements Issued by and Correspondence between Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, September 1933*, Lucknow. n.d.
- Writings and Speeches of Mahatma Gandhi, Relating to Bihar from 1917 to 1947*. ed. by K.K. Datta, Bihar Government 1960.
- Hume, A.O. : *A Speech on the Indian National Congress, its Origin, Aims and Objects*, Calcutta 1888.
- Imam, Syed Ali : *Speech of Mr. Syed Ali Imam, Bar-at-law, President of the All India Muslim League, Amritsar Session, 1908*, Bankipore, 1908.
- Irwin, Lord : *Speeches of Lord Irwin*. 2 Vols., Simla, 1930-31.
- Iyer, G.S. : *Presidential Address at the North Arcot District Conference, August 1907*, Madras.
- Speeches and Writings*, Madras 1918.
- Iyengar, Sriman S. Srinivas : *His Presidential Address of the 41st Indian National Congress and other Speeches*, Madras. n.d.
- Joshi, G.V. : *Writings and Speeches*, Poona, 1912.
- Jinnah, M.A. : *Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah's Correspondence*, ed. by Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, Karachi, 1960.
- Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, ed. by Jamil-ud-din Ahmed, Lahore, 1952.

- Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quaid-i-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah (1911-34 and 1947-48),** Lahore : Research Society of Pakistan, University of Punjab, 1966.
- Speeches and Writings of M.A. Jinnah (1912-17),** Madras, Ganesh, 1918.
- Malaviya, Madan Mohan : Speeches and Writings.** Second ed. Madras, Natesan, 1919.
- Mehta, Sir Pheroz Shah Merwanji : Speeches and writings of Pheroz Shah Mehta,** ed. by C.Y. Chintamani, Allahabad, 1905.
- Some Unpublished and Later Speeches and Writings of Sir Pheroz Shah Mehta,** ed. by J.R.B. Jeejeebhoy, Bombay, 1918.
- Minto, Earl : Speeches,** Calcutta, 1911.
- Mitra, Rajendralal : Raja Rajendra Lal Mitra's Speeches.** ed. by J. Mitter, Calcutta, 1892.
- Naoroji, Dadabhai : Speeches and Writings.** Madras, Natesan, 1910.
- Essays, Speeches and Writings,** ed. by C.L. Parekh, Bombay, 1887.
- Naidu, Sarojini : Speeches and Writings,** Madras, Natesan, 1925.
- Nehru, Jawahar Lal : Independence and After. A Collection of Speeches.** New York, 1950.
- A Bunch of Old Letters,** Bombay, 1958.
- India and the World : Essays,** London, 1936.
- Eighteen Months in India, 1936-1937. Being Further Essays and Writings.** Allahabad, 1938.
- China, Spain and the War : Essays and Writings,** Allahabad, Kitabistan, 1940.
- Statements, Speeches and Writings,** Allahabad, 1929.
- Whither India,** Allahabad, Kitabistan, 1933.
- Recent Essays and Writings on the future of India, Communalism and other Subjects,** Allahabad, Kitabistan, 1934.
- Peace and India,** London, India League, 1938.
- The Unity of India, Collected Writings, 1937-40,** ed. by V.K. Krishna Menon, London, L. Drummond, 1941.
- Before and After Independence. A Collection of the Most Important and Soul Stirring Speeches Delivered During the Most Important and Soul-Stirring Years in India's History 1922-50,** ed. by J.S. Bright, New Delhi, 1950.
- Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches. 1946-48. Vol. I,** Publications Division, Government of India, 1949.
- Pal, Bepin Chandra : Speeches Delivered at Madras,** Madras, 1907.
- Patel, Sardar Vallabhbhai : Sardar Patel's Correspondence** ed. by Durga Das. 10 Vols. Navjivan, Ahmedabad.
- Ranade, M.G. : The Miscellaneous Writings of the Late Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade,** ed. by R. Ranade, Bombay, 1915.
- Rai, Lala Lajpat : India's Will to Freedom-Writings and Speeches on the Present Situation,** Natesan, Madras.
- Writings and Speeches,** Madras, 1921.
- Writings and Speeches.** ed. by V.C. Joshi, 2 Vols. Delhi. 1966.
- Sastri, V.S.S. : Speeches and Writings of the Pt. Hon. V.S. Srinivas Sastri,** Madras, 1924.

- Savarkar, V.D. : **Hindu Rashtra Darshan : A Collection of the Presidential Speeches delivered from the Hindu Mahasabha Platform.** India Printing Works, Bombay, 1949.
- Sen, Keshab Chandra : **Lectures in India,** Cassel and Co., London, 1904.  
**Lectures in India,** Cassel and Co. London, 1901.  
**Keshab Chandra in England.**
- Telang, K.T. : **Selected Writings and Speeches,** ed. by V.V. Thakur, Bombay, 1916.
- Tilak, Bal Gangadhar : **Two Remarkable Speeches,** Sylhet, 1907.  
**Speeches on Home Rule,** Benaras, 1917.  
**Writings and Speeches,** Ganesh, Madras, 1919.
- Wach, Dinshaw Edulji : **Speeches and Writings,** Natesan, Madras, 1918.

#### **E. News Papers**

1. Amrita Bazar Patrika.
2. Aligarh Institute Gazette.
3. Bengal Harkaru.
4. Bengal Spectator.
5. Bengalee.
6. Behar Herald.
7. Bombay Chronicle.
8. Englishman.
9. Friend of India.
10. Forward.
11. Hindu.
12. Hindoo Patriot.
13. Hindustan Times.
14. Hindustan Standard.
15. Indian Nation.
16. Indian Mirror.
17. Indian Spectator.
18. Indian National Herald.
19. Indian Daily News.
20. Japanese Weekly Chronicle.
21. Japan Weekly Mail.
22. Leader.
23. Mahratta.
24. Moslem Chronicle.
25. Manchester Guardian.
26. New York Times.
27. Native Paper Reports.
28. New York Herald Tribune.
29. Pioneer.
30. Star of India.
31. Statesman.
32. Times, London.

33. Times of India.
34. Tribune.

**F. Journals and Periodicals**

1. Asia.
2. Asiatic Review.
3. Afro-Asian and World Affairs.
4. Asiatic Quarterly Review (London).
5. American Historical Review.
6. Atlantic Monthly.
7. Bengal : Past and Present.
8. Calcutta Review.
9. Contemporary Japan.
10. Current Studies.
11. East and West.
12. Far Eastern Survey.
13. Harijan.
14. Hindustan Review.
15. Indian Review.
16. India Quarterly.
17. Indian Annual Register.
18. Indian Quarterly Register.
19. India.
20. International Organisation.
21. International Affairs.
22. Independent India.
23. Journal of Indian History.
24. Journal of the Bihar Research Society.
25. Journal of Historical Research.
26. Modern Review.
27. National Review.
28. Nineteenth Century.
29. Nineteenth Century and After.
30. Pacific Affairs.
31. Panchajanya.
32. Quarterly Review of Historical Studies
33. United Asia.
34. Viswabharati Quarterly.
35. Young India.

**SECONDARY SOURCES**

- Adloff, Richard and Thompson, Virginia: *Minority Problems in South East Asia*, Stanford University, Press, 1955.
- Aga Khan, The : *India in Transition*. London, 1918.

- Ahmad, A. Khan : *The Foundation of Pakistan*, London, 1963.
- Ahmad, M. : *Pakistan and the Middle East* Karachi. Kitabi Markaz, 1948.
- Ahluwalia, M. M. : *Freedom Struggle in India. 1858-1909*. Ranjit Printers and Publishers. Delhi, 1965.
- Albiruni, A.H. : *Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India*, Lahore, 1950.
- Ali, Mohammed : *My Life : A Fragment*, Lahore, 1942.
- Ali, Chowdhary Rahmat : *Pakistan, the Fatherland of the Pak Nation*, Bombay, 1966.
- Ambedkar, B. R. : *Pakistan or the Partition of India*, Bombay, Thacker, 1946.
- Andrews, C. F. : *The Renaissance in India*, London, 1912.
- Andrews, C.F. and Mukherjee, G. : *The Rise and Growth of the Congress in India*, London, 1938.
- Appadorai, A. : (ed) *India-Studies in Social and Political Development, 1947-1967*. Indian Political Thinking : From Naoroji to Nehru : Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Arbuthnote, Alexander J : (ed) *Major-General Sir Thomas Munro : Selections from His Minutes and Other Official Writings, Vol II*, London, 1881.
- Argov, Daniel : *Moderates and Extremists in the Indian National Movement 1883-1923*, Bombay, 1968.
- Athalye, D. V. : *The Life of Lokamanya Tilak*. Poona, 1921.
- Ayer, S. A : *The Indian Independence Movement in East Asia*, Netaji Research Bureau Bulletin, Vol. II, July, 1961.
- Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam : *India Wins Freedom*. Calcutta, Orient Longmans, 1959.
- Aziz, K. K. : *Britain and Muslim India*, London, 1967.
- Banerjee, Surendranath : *A Nation in Making. Being the Reminiscences of Fifty Years of Public Life*. London, Oxford University Press, 1925.
- Banerjee, Kalyan Kumar : *Indian Freedom Movement—Revolutionaries in America*. Jijnasa, Calcutta, 1969.
- Banerjee, A. C. : *The Making of the Indian Constitution, 1939-47*, Calcutta, 1948.
- Banerjee, A. C. and Bose, A. N. : *The Cabinet Mission in India*, Calcutta, 1946.
- Bagal, J. C : *History of the Indian Association 1876-1951*, Calcutta, 1953.
- Bandyopadhyay, J. : *Indian Nationalism vs. International Communism*, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1966.
- Bandarnaike, S. W. R. D. : *Towards a New Era*. Colombo, 1961.
- Bapat, S. Y. : *Reminiscences of Lokamanya Tilak*, Poona, 1921.
- Bary, William Theodore De : (ed) *Sources of Indian Tradition*, Oxford.
- Barker, A. J. : *The March on Delhi*, London, 1963.
- Ball, W. Mac Mohan : *Nationalism and Communism in East Asia*. Melbourne University Press, 1952.
- Bahadur, Lal : *Muslim League : Agra*, 1954.
- Besant, Annie : *India's Awakening*. Benaras, Theosophical Publishing Society, 1906.
- India and the Empire, London, 1914.
- How India Wrought For Freedom, Adyar, Madras, 1915.
- India : Bond or Free? A World Problem, London, Putnam, 1926.

- Bennett, G. :** *The Concept of Empire from Burke to Atlee, 1774-1947*, London, 1953.
- Bevan, Edwin :** *Indian Nationalism*, London, 1914.
- Beck, Theodore :** *Essays on Indian Topics*, Allahabad, 1888.
- Beams, John :** *Memoirs of a Bengal Civilian*, London, 1961.
- Bhan, Suraj :** *Dayananda : His Life and Works*, Jullundur, 1956.
- Bhattacharjee, P. P. :** *India and Politics of Modern Nepal*, Calcutta, 1970.
- Blunt, Wilfred Scawen :** *India under Ripon: A Private Diary*. London, 1909.
- Bose, N. S. :** *Indian Awakening and Bengal*, Calcutta, 1969.  
*The Indian National Movement: An Outline* : Firma, K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1965.
- Bose, Subhas Chandra :** *The Indian Struggle, 1920-42*.  
*Crossroads*, Calcutta, 1962.  
*The Mission of Life*, Calcutta, 1968.  
*An Indian Pilgrim*, Calcutta, 1965.
- Bose, A. C. :** *Indian Revolutionaries Abroad, 1905-20 in the Background of International Developments*. Unpublished Thesis, Patna University.
- Bolitho, Hector :** *Jinnah : Creator of Pakistan*, London, 1954.
- Brailsford, Henry Noel :** *Rebel India*, New York, 1931.  
*Subject India*, New York, Johnway, 1913.
- Brecher, M. :** *Nehru : A Political Biography*, Oxford, 1959.  
*The New States of Asia*.
- Brown, D. Mackenzie :** *Indian Political Thought, From Ranade to Bhave*, Berkeley, 1961.
- Buchan, John :** *Lord Minto : A Memoir*, London, 1924.
- Buch, M. A. :** *The Development of Contemporary Indian Political Thought*, Baroda, 1938.  
*Rise and Growth of Indian Militant Nationalism*.
- Buckland, C. E. :** *Bengal under the Lieutenant-Governors, 2 Vols* , Calcutta, 1901.  
*Dictionary of Indian Biography*, London, 1906.
- Campbell, G. :** *Memoirs of My Indian Career, 2 Vols*. London, 1893.
- Caveeshar, S. S. :** *India's Fight for Freedom* : Lahore, 1936.
- Chailley, J. :** *Administrative Problems of British India*, London, 1910.
- Chand, Uttam :** *When Bose was Ziauddin*, Delhi, Rajkamal, 1946.
- Chand, Tara :** *History of the Freedom Movement in India, 4 Vols*.
- Chandra, Bipin :** *The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, 1966.
- Chamanlal :** *Secrets of Japan*, Tokyo, 1937.
- Chakravarti, P. C :** *India China Relations*, Firma, K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta.
- Chatterjee, Ramananda :** *Towards Home Rule. 2 Vols*. Calcutta, 1917.
- Chatterjee, Nandalal :** *India's Freedom Struggle*, Indian Press, Allahabad, 1958.
- Chatterjee, A.C. :** *India's Struggle for Freedom*, Calcutta, 1947.
- Chaudhuri, B. M. :** *Muslim Politics in India*, Calcutta, 1946.
- Chirrol, Valentine :** *Fifty years in a Changing World*. London, 1927.  
*Indian Unrest*, London, 1921.  
*India : Old and New*, London, 1921.

- Chintamani, C.Y. and Masani, M.R. : *India's Constitution at Work*, Bombay, 1940.
- Close, Upton : *The Revolt of Asia*, New York, 1927.
- Collet, Sophia Dobson, : *The Life and Letters of Raja Ram Mohan Roy*, London, 1900.
- Colebrooke, T.E. : *Life of the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone*, Vol., II, London, 1884.
- Coatman, J. : *Years of Destiny: India, 1926-32*, London, 1932.
- Cotton, H.J S. : *New India or India in Transition*, London, 1885.
- Coupland, R. : *Britain and India, 1600-1941*, London, 1941.
- The Indian Problem*, Oxford, 1942.
- Report on the Constitutional Problem in India, Part II*, Oxford, 1944.
- India : A Restatement*, Oxford, 1945.
- Cumming, J. : (ed) *Political India, 1832-1932*. Oxford, 1932.
- Das, M.N. : *India under Morley and Minto*, 1964.
- Das, Durga : *India From Curzon to Nehru and After*, London, 1969.
- Das, C.R. : *India for the Indians*, : Madras, 1921.
- Das, Taraknath : *India in World Politics*, New York, 1923.
- Datta, K.K. : *Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India*, Bookland, Calcutta, 1965.
- Dawn of Renascent India*.
- Deb, J.M. : *India Unreconciled*, Bombay, 1945.
- Desai, Mahadev Haribhai, Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad : *The President of the Indian National Congress a Biographical Memoir*, Agra, 1946.
- With Gandhiji in Ceylon. A Journal of the Tour with Authorised version of All Important Speeches*, Madras, Ganesan, 1228.
- Desai, A.R. : *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Oxford, 1949.
- Desai, Bhulabhai : *The I.N.A. Defence*, Delhi, 1945.
- Desai, W.S. : *India and Burma, A Study*, Bombay, 1954.
- Dilke, Sir Charles Wentworth : *Greater Britain*, London, 1890.
- The British Empire*, London, 1899.
- Dua, R.P. : *The Impact of the Russo-Japanese War (1905) On Indian Politics*, S. Chand and Co., Delhi.
- Dutt, Rajani Palm : *Modern India*, Bombay, 1926.
- India Today*, London, 1940.
- Dutt, R.C. : *Economic History of India-Early British Rule*, London, 1956.
- Dwarkadas, Kanji, *India's Fight For Freedom, 1913-1937 : An Eye-Witness Story*, Bombay, 1966.
- Gandhi Through My Diary Leaves*, Bombay, 1950.
- Dwivedi, P. : (ed) *The Life and Speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru*, Allahabad, 1929.
- Edwardes, Michael : *The Last Years of British India*, 1963.
- Earquhar, J.N. : *Modern Religious Movement in India*, London, 1929.
- Faruqi, Ziya-ul-Hasan : *The Deoband School and the Demand For Pakistan*, London, 1963.
- Fischer, Louis : *A Week with Gandhi*, New York, 1942.
- The Great Challenge*, New York, 1946.

- The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, New York, 1950.**
- Fisher, Fred B : India's Silent Revolution.**
- Fletcher, Arnold : Afghanistan : Highway of Conquest. Cornell University Press, New York, 1966.**
- Forster, E.M. : A Passage to India, New York, 1924.**
- Fraser, A.L. : India under Curzon and After, London, 1911.**
- Frazer, R.W. : Literary History of India.**
- Furnival, J.S. : Colonial Policy and Practice, Cambridge, 1948.**
- Gokhale, B.G. : The Making of the Indian Nation, Bombay, 1960.**
- Gandhi, M K. : The Story of My Experiments with Truth. Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1940.**
- Communal Unity. Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1949.**
- Hind Swaraj, Madras, 1921.**
- Non Violence in Peace and War, 2 Vols, Navjivan, 1948-49.**
- Young India, Vol. I, 1919-22. Vol. II, 1924-26.**
- Ghose, Aurobindo : The Doctrine of Passive Resistance, Pondicherry, 1952.**
- Bankim, Tilak, Dayananda, Calcutta, 1940.**
- Ghose, P.C. : The Development of the Indian National Congress, Calcutta, 1960.**
- Ghose, Man Mohan : China's Conflict with India and the Soviet Union, Calcutta, 1969.**
- Ghose, S : Gandhi's Emissary, 1967.**
- Ghose, Jogesh Chunder : (ed) The English Works of Ram Mohan Roy. Pannini Office, Allahabad, 1906.**
- Giani, K.S : Indian Independence Movement in East Asia, Lahore, 1947.**
- Gidumal, Dayaram : The Life and Work of Behram M. Malabari, Bombay, 1888.**
- Gopal, S. : The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, Oxford, 1953.**
- The Viceroyalty of Lord Irwin, Oxford, 1957.**
- British Policy in India. 1858-1905, Cambridge, 1965.**
- Gopal, Ram : Indian Muslims. A Political History, London, 1959.**
- Lokamanya Tilak. A Biography, Bombay, 1956.**
- Graham, G.F.I. : The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, London, 1909.**
- Gregorian, Vartan : The Emergence of Modern Afghanistan, Stanford University Press, 1969.**
- Griffiths, P.J. : The British Impact on India, London, 1952.**
- The British in India, London, 1946.**
- Grover, B L. : A Documentary Study of British Policy Towards Indian Nationalism, 1885-1909, New Delhi, 1967.**
- Gupta, Sisir : India and Regional Integration in India, Bombay, 1964.**
- Gupta, A. : (ed) Studies in the Bengal Renaissance, Jadavpur, 1958.**
- Gurunadhan, J. : Viresalingam : The Founder of Telegu Public Life, 1911.**
- Gupta, J.C., Das : A National Biography for India, Dacca, 1911.**
- Hall, D. G. E. : Burma.**
- Halifax, Earl G : Fulness of Days, London, 1957.**
- Hardinge, Lord : My Indian Years : Reminiscences, London, 1948.**
- Harrison, Marqu erite : Asia Reborn, New York, 1928.**
- Heimsath, Charles, H. : Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, New Jersey, 1964.**

- Hingorani, Anand T : (ed) *The Hindu-Muslim Unity*, Bombay, 1965.
- Houghton, Bernard : *The Revolt of the East*, Madras, 1921.
- Husain, Abid : *The Destiny of Indian Muslims*, Bombay, 1965.
- Hume, A.C. : *The Star in the East; or the Bengal National League*, Calcutta, 1886.
- Hunter, W.W. : *The Indian Mussalmans*, London, 1871.
- Hutchins, Francis, G. : *The Illusion of Permanence : British Imperialism in India*, New Jersey, 1967.
- Ikram, S M. : *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan*, Lahore, 1965.
- Ike, Nobutake : *Japan's Decision For War*, Stanford, 1967.
- Ispahani, M.A.H. : *Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah. As I knew Him*, Karachi, 1966.
- Ishaque, M : *Modern Persian Poetry*, Calcutta 1943.
- Iyer, C.S Ranga : *India in the Crucible*, London, 1928.
- Iyer, G.S. : *Some Economic Aspects of British Rule in India*, Madras, 1903.
- Jain, M.S. : *The Aligarh Movement*, 1965.
- Jansen, G H. : *Afro-Asian and Non-Alignment*, London, 1965.
- Jayakar, M.R. : *Social Reform and Social Service*, Madras, 1917.
- The Story of My Life*, 2 Vols., Bombay, 1958-59.
- Jeffries, Sir Charles : *Ceylon—The Path to Independence*, London, 1962.
- Jones, F C. : *Japan's New Order in East Asia, 1937-45*, London, 1954.
- Jinnah-Gandhi Talks September, 1944, Delhi, A.I.M.L , 1944.
- Karuna Karan, K.P. : *India in World Affairs ; 1947-50*, Bombay, 1952.
- Kelkar, N C. : *The Case For Indian Home Rule*. Poona, 1917.
- Khan, Sir Syed Ahmed : *An Easay on the Causes of the Indian Revolt*, Calcutta 1860.
- The Present State of Indian Politics*. Allahabad, 1888.
- Khan, Shahnawaz : *My Memories of I.N A. and its Netaji*, Delhi, 1946.
- Khaliquzzaman : *Pathway to Pakistan*, Lahore, 1961.
- Khan, Ghani : *The Pathans*, Bombay, 1947.
- Khanal, Y.N. : *Foreign Policy of Nepal*.
- Khosla, G.D : *Stern Reckoning : A Survey of the events leading upto and following the Partition of India*, New Delhi, 1949.
- Kidwai, M H : *Swaraj and How to Obtain It*. Lucknow, 1924.
- Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism*, London, 1937.
- Kirk, G.E. : *A Short History of the Middle East*, London, 1961.
- Kondapi, C. : *Indians Overseas, 1838-1949*, Delhi, 1951.
- Kothari, S. : *India's Emerging Foreign Policies*, Bombay, 1951.
- Kohn, Hans : *A History of Nationalism in the East*, London, 1929.
- Kripalani, J B : *Non-Violent Revolution*, Bombay, Vora and Co , 1938.
- Kripalani, Krishna : *Tagore : A Life*. New Delhi, 1961.
- Kulkarni, V B. : *British Statesmen in India*, Orient Longmans, 1961.
- Kundra, J C : *Indian Foreign Policy, 1947-54*. Groningen, Wotlers, 1955.
- Lawton, Lancelot : *Empire in the Far East Vol II* London, 1912
- Levi, Werner : *Free India in Asia*. Minnesota, 1953.
- The Challenge of World Politics in South East Asia.*

- Lenczowski, George : The Middle East in World Affairs. Cornell University Press, 1969.**
- Li, Tieh-Tseng : The Historical status of Tibet.**
- Lovett, V. : History of the Indian Nationalist Movement, London, 1921.**
- Lohia, Ram Manohar : Indian Foreign Policy, Allahabad, 1938.**
- Lumby, E.W.R. : The Transfer of Power in India, 1945-47, London, 1954.**
- Lyll, A.C. : The Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava., 2 Vols., London, 1905.**
- Mac Donald, Ramsay : The Awakening of India, London, 1910.**
- Majumdar, B B. : History of Indian Social and Political Ideas . From Ram Mohan to Dayananda, Bookland, Calcutta, 1967.**
- Indian Political Associations and Reform of Legislature (1818-1917), Calcutta, 1965.**
- Majumdar, B.B. and B.P. : Congress and Congressmen in Pre-Gandhian Era (1885-1917), Calcutta, 1967.**
- Majumdar, R.C. : History of the Freedom Movement in India, 3 Vols., Calcutta, 1971, (1962-63).**
- Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century, 1960.**
- (ed) The History and Culture of the Indian People : Struggle for Swaraj, Bombay, 1969.**
- Majumdar, P.C. : The Faith and Progress of the Brahmo Samaj, Calcutta, 1934.**
- Majumdar, S.K. : Jinnah and Gandhi, Calcutta, 1966.**
- Majumdar, P.C : The Life and Teachings of Keshab Chandra Sen, Calcutta, 1887.**
- Mallik, D.N. : The Development of Non-Alignment in Indian Foreign Policy, Allahabad, 1967.**
- Mallik, Hafeez : Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Washington, 1963.**
- Martineau, Harriet : Suggestions towards the Future Govt. of India, London, 1958.**
- Masani, R.P. : Dadabhai Naoroji : The Grand Old Man of India, London, 1939.**
- Masani, M R. : The Communist Party of India, A Short History London, 1954.**
- Maung Maung : Burma and General Newin, Bombay, 1969.**
- Max Muller : Ram Mohan to Ram Krishna, Calcutta, 1952.**
- Mazumdar, A C. : Indian National Evolution, Madras, Natesan, 1915.**
- Mc. Cully, Bruce Tiebout : English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism, New York, 1940.**
- Menon, V.P. : The Transfer of Power in India, New Jersey, 1957.**
- Mehta, A and Patwardhan, A. : The Communal Triangle in India, Second ed. Allahabad, 1942.**
- Mehtap, M.A. : Whys of the Great Indian Conflict, Lahore, 1947.**
- Mehrotra, S.R. : India and the Common Wealth, 1885-1929, London, 1965.**
- The Emergence of the Indian National Congress, Delhi, 1971.**
- Metcalfe, T.R. : The Aftermath of Revolt, 1857-70, New Jersey, 1965.**
- Minto, Lady: India : Minto and Morley (1905-10). London, 1935.**
- Mitra, Sisir Kumar : Resurgent India, Bombay, 1963.**
- Mody, H P. : Sir Phiroz Shah Mehta, Bombay, 1921.**
- Morley, Viscount : Recollections, Vol II.**
- Mukherjee, Hirendranath : India's Struggle for Freedom, Bombay, 1948.**
- Mukherjee, H. and U : Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought, Calcutta, 1958.**

- 'Bande Mataram' and Indian Nationalism, Calcutta, 1957.**  
**India's Fight For Freedom, Calcutta, 1958.**  
**The Growth of Nationalism in India (1857-1905), Calcutta, 1952.**  
**Mukherjee, S. : Communalism in Muslim Politics and Troubles over India, Calcutta, 1947.**  
**Nag, Kalidas : Discovery of Asia, Calcutta, 1957.**  
**Greater India, Calcutta, 1960.**  
**Nag, D.S. : Imperialism in South East Asia.**  
**Nair, Sankaran : Gandhi and Anarchy, Indore, 1922.**  
**Nanda, B R. : The Nehrus : Motilal and Jawaharlal, London, 1962.**  
**Naoroji, Dadabhai : Poverty and un-British Rule in India, London, 1901.**  
**Nariman, K Y. : Whither Congress, Bombay, 1933.**  
**Narayan, Jai Prakash : Towards Struggle, Bombay, 1946.**  
**Narvane, V.S. : Modern Indian Thought: A Philosophical Survey, Bombay, 1964.**  
**Natarajan, S. : A Century of Social Reform in India, Bombay, 1954.**  
**A History of the Press in India, Bombay, 1962.**  
**Natesan, G.A. : (ed) Introduction to Indian Politics. Madras, 1891.**  
**Eminent Mussalmans, Madras, 1925.**  
**Sir Syed Ahmed Khan—A Sketch of His Life and Career.**  
**Badruddin Tyabji—A Sketch of His Life and Career.**  
**Rahimuttala Sayani—A Sketch of His Life and Career.**  
**Nehru, J.L. : The Discovery of India, New York, 1946.**  
**Autobiography, New York, 1941.**  
**Glimpses of World History, 4 Vols., Allahabad, 1934-35.**  
**The Parting of the Ways, Allahabad, 1941.**  
**What India Wants, London, 1942.**  
**Nehru Motilal : Builders of Modern India Series.**  
**Nevison, H.W. : The New Spirit in India, London, 1908.**  
**Noman, M. : Muslim India : Rise and Growth of the All India Muslim League, Allahabad, 1942.**  
**Norman, Dorothy : (ed) Nehru : The First Sixty Years, 2 Vols., Bombay, 1969.**  
**O' Dwyer, M. : India as I knew It, 1885-1923, London, 1925.**  
**O' Donnell, C.J. : The Causes of Present Discontent in India, London, 1908.**  
**The Failure of Lord Curzon, London, 1903.**  
**Olcott, H S. : Old Diary Leaves, Madras, 1928.**  
**O' Malley, L.S S. : Modern India and the West, Oxford, 1941.**  
**The Indian Civil Service, London, 1931.**  
**Pal, B C. : The Indian National Congress, Lahore, 1887.**  
**The Spirit of Indian Nationalism, Lahore, 1910.**  
**Swadeshi and Swaraj, Calcutta, 1954.**  
**Memories of My Life and Times, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1932, 1951.**  
**Brahmo Samaj and the Battle of Swaraj, Madras, 1930.**  
**Swaraj, The Goal and the Way, Madras, 1921.**  
**Panikkar, K.M. : Asia and Western Dominance, London, 1959.**  
**The Future of India and South East Asia, London, 1945.**  
**The Afro-Asian States and Their Problems, London.**

- India and the Indian Ocean, London.  
In Two Chinas, London.
- Pandey, B.N. : The Break-up of British India, London, 1969.
- Parekh, C.L. : Eminent Indians on Indian Politics, Bombay, 1892.
- Parikh, N.D. : Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Ahmedabad, 1953.
- Parikh, M.L. : Brahmarshi Keshab Chandra Sen.
- Parvate, T.V. : Mahadev Govind Ranade. A Biography, London, 1963.  
Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Ahmedabad, 1958.  
Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Ahmedabad, 1959.
- Payne, Robert : The Revolt of Asia, New York, 1947.
- Pirzada, Syed Sharifuddin : Evolution of Pakistan, Lahore, 1963.
- Polak and Others : Mahatma Gandhi.
- Pole, Graham. D. : India in Transition, 1932.
- Power, Paul F : Gandhi On World Affairs, London.
- Prabhu, R.K. and Rao, U.R. : The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi, Oxford University Press.
- Pradhan, R.G. : India's Struggle for Swaraj, Madras, 1930.
- Prasad, Amba : The Indian Revolt of 1942, Delhi, 1958.
- Prasad, Bimal : The Origins of Indian Foreign Policy, Bookland, Calcutta, 1962.
- Prasad, Rajendra : India Divided, Bombay, 1947.
- Prakash, Indra : A Review of the History and Work of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Hindu Sangathan Movement, New Delhi, 1938.
- Pyarelal : Mahatma Gandhi : The Last Phase, 2 Vols Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1958.
- Punjabi, K.L. : The Indomitable Sardar, Bombay, 1962.
- Puntambekar, S.K.V. : The Developing Unity of Asia.
- Radhakrishnan, S. : India and China, Bombay, 1944.
- Raghuvanshi, V.P.S. : Indian Nationalist Movement and Thought, Agra, 1959.
- Rai, Lajpat : The Arya Samaj, London, 1915.  
The Political Future of India, New York, 1919.  
Young India. New York, 1917.
- Rajagopalachari, Chakrovarti : The Way out, London, 1944.
- Rajkumar, N.V. : Development of the Congress Constitution, New Delhi, A.I.C.C., 1949.
- (ed) The Background of India's Foreign Policy, New Delhi, A.I.C.C., 1952.
- Rajput, A.B. : Muslim League Yesterday and Today, Lahore, 1948.
- Ram Krishna : Prophet of New India, (Abridged from "the Gospel of Sri Ram Krishna", and trans. into English by Swami Nikhilananda), London, 1948.
- Ratcliffe, S.K. : Sir William Wedderburn and the Indian Reform Movement, London, 1923.
- Rawlinson, H. G. : The British Achievements in India, London, 1948.
- Ray, Sibnarayan : (ed) Gandhi, India and the World, An International Symposium.
- Rice, Stanley : The Challenge of Asia, London, 1925.
- Romein, Jan : The Asian Century : A History of Modern Nationalism in Asia, London, 1962.
- Ronaldshay, Earl G : The Heart of Aryavrata. The Psychology of Indian Unrest, London 1925.

- Row, S. Bhim Sankara : *The 22nd Indian National Congress, 1907*, I.O.L. Pract, 1028.
- Roy, M.N. : *India in Transition*, Geneva, 1922.
- Roy, B.P. Singh : *Parliamentary Government in India*, Calcutta, Thacker, 1942.
- Russell, W.H. : *My Diary in India, 1858-59*, 2 Vols., London, 1860.
- Sahni, Ruchi Ram : *The Awakening of Asia*, Lahore, 1929.
- Saitoh, Shun : (ed) *Japan and India*, Tokyo, 1912.
- Saiyid, M.H. : *Mohammed Ali Jinnah. A Political Study*, Lahore, 1953.
- Samuelson, James : *India : Past and Present*.
- Sanyal, Sachindranath : *Bandijiwan*, Delhi, 1963.
- Sarda, Har Bilas : *Life of Dayananda Saraswati*, Ajmer, 1946.
- Satyapal and Probodh Chandra : *Sixty years of the Congress*, Lahore, 1946.
- Savarkar, V.D. : *Hindu Sangathan, Its Ideology and Immediate Programme*, Bombay, 1940.
- Sayeed, Khalid, B : *Pakistan : The Formative Phase 1857-1948*, London, 1968.
- Seely, J.R. : *The Expansion of England*, London, 1884.
- Scherer, James, A.B. : *Japan's Advance*, Tokyo, 1934.
- Seal, Anil : *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism*, Cambridge, 1968.
- Sharan, P. : *The Imperial Legislative Council of India*, Delhi, 1961.
- Sharma, Brij Mohan : *Swami Dayananda : His Life and Teachings*, Lucknow, 1933.
- Sharma, Ram Bilas : *Bhartendu Harischandra*.
- Sherwood, R.E. : *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, New York, 1948.
- Shradhananda, Swami : *Inside the Congress*.
- Shridharni, Krishnalal : *Warning to the West*, Bombay, 1944.
- Singh, Bawa Chhajju : *The Life and Teachings of Swami Dayananda Saraswati*, Lahore, 1903.
- The Teachings of the Arya Samaj*, Lahore, 1903.
- Singh, H.L. : *Problems and Policies of the British in India, 1885-98*, Bombay, 1963.
- Singh, Harnam : *The Indian National Movement and American Opinion*, Delhi, 1963.
- Singh, Iqbal : *India's Foreign Policy*, Bombay, 1946.
- Singhal, D.P. : *Nationalism in India and Other Historical Essays*, Delhi, 1967.
- Sinnet, A.P. : *The Occult World*, 6th ed., London, 1892.
- Sitaram : *From Sepoy to Subadar : Being the Life and Adventures of a Native Officer of the Bengal Army Written and Related by Himself*, Calcutta, 1911.
- Sitaramayya, B.P. : *The History of the Indian National Congress*, 2 Vols., Bombay, 1946.
- Smith, W.C. : *Modern Islam in India*, Lahore, 1954.
- Some Arya Samajists : The Arya Samaj*, Lahore.
- Strachey, J. : *India*, London, 1888.
- Stephen, Leslie : *The Life of Sir James Fitz James*, New York, 1895.
- Sundaram, Lanka : *India in World Politics*, Lahore, 1944.
- Sunderlal : *A Study of the Hindu-Muslim Problem in India*, Allahabad, 1933.
- Sunderland, J.T. : *India in Bondage*, 1929.
- Suleri, Zia-up-din Ahmed : *My Leader*, 3rd ed., Lahore, 1946.
- Studies in Asian History*, Bombay, 1969.

- Symonds, R. : The Making of Pakistan, London, 1950.**
- Sykes, Sir Percy M. : History of Afghanistan, Vol. II, London, 1940.**
- Tagore, Rabindranath : Nationalism, London, 1917.**
- Tagore, Rabindranath : A Centenary Volume 1861-1961, New Delhi, 1961.**
- Tagore's Talks in China, Calcutta, 1924.**
- Tagore, Debendranath : Autobiography (Trans. by S. Tagore and Indra Devi), London, 1914.**
- Tahmarkar, D.V. : Lokmanya Tilak, London, 1956.**
- Tarling, Nicholas : A Concise History of South East Asia, New York, 1956.**
- Templewood, Viscount : Nine Troubled years, London, 1954.**
- Tendulkar, D.G. : Mahatma : Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, 8 Vols., Bombay, 1951-54.**
- Thompson, E.J. and Garrat, G.T. : Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India, London, 1934.**
- Thien, Ton That : India and South East Asia, 1947-1960, Geneva, 1963.**
- Tinker, Hugh : The Union of Burma, London, 1967.**
- Toye, Hugh : Subhas Chandra Bose : The Springing Tiger, Bombay, 1957.**
- Trevelyan, G.O. : Cawnpore, London, 1910.**
- Tripathi, A. : The Extremist Challenge, 1957.**
- Tyabji, H.B. : Badruddin Tyabji, Bombay, 1952.**
- Vaidya, K.B. : And Now China, Bombay, 1945.**
- Verma, D.N. : India and the League of Nations.**
- Vivekananda, Swami : Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda, 8 Vols., Almora, 1931.**
- A Centenary Volume.**
- Wasti, Syed Razi : Lord Minto and the Indian Nationalist Movement 1905-10, Oxford, 1964.**
- Wedderburn, W. : Allan Octavian Hume, London, 1913.**
- Whitehead, H. : Indian Problems : In Religion Education and Politics, London, 1924.**
- Williams, Rushbrook : India in the Years, 1917-18, 1919 etc.**
- Willkie, W.L. : One World. New York, 1943.**
- Wolf, Lucien : Life of the First Marquess of Ripon, 2 Vols., London, 1921.**
- Woodruff, Philip : Men who Ruled India, The Guardians, London, 1954.**
- Wolpert, S.A. : Tilak and Gokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India, Berkeley, 1962.**
- Zacharias, H.C.E : Renascent India : From Rammohan Roy to Mohandas Gandhi London, 1933.**
- Zakaria. Rafiq : Rise of Muslims in Indian Politics. Bombay, 1970.**

## INDEX

- Abdul Bari, 59, 60, 76  
 Abdul Hamid II, 30, 49  
 Abdul Majid Khan, 209  
 Abdur Qadir, Shaikh, 49, 59  
 Abdur Rahim, 136  
 Abdur Rahman Azzam Bay, 210  
 Afghanistan, 8, 40, 58-9, 95-7, 132  
 Aga Khan, 37, 54, 56, 74, 107, 110, 141, 145, 151  
 Ahmad, Haji, 52  
 Ahmed, Shaikh, 149  
 Ahmed Khan, Aga, 99  
 Ahmed Sayeed, Maulana, 143  
 Aisawa I, 176  
 Aiyer, C.P. Ramaswami, 136  
 Ajmal Khan, Hakim, 78, 83, 96  
 Akali Dal, 101  
 AKhundzada, Mullah Mahmud, 98  
*Al-Balagh*, 95  
*Al-Hilal*, 51, 52, 55, 56, 95  
*Al-Muin*, 52  
 Alexander, A.V., 191  
 Ali Imam, 73  
 Aligarh College Khilafat Committee, 81  
*Aligarh Institute Gazette*, 52  
 Aligarh Movement, 13-14  
 All Asia Women Conference (1931) 129, 174-7  
 All Ceylon Indian Youths' Conference (1929), 93  
 All India Anti-Peace Celebration Committee, 77  
 All India Azad Muslim Board, 149  
 All India Muslim League, 16-17, 39, 48, 50, 55, 60, 72-3, 228  
     Day of Deliverance, 121  
     Direct Action Day, 192  
     Divide and Quit Slogan, 125  
     Formation, 38  
     Fourteen Points (1929), 74  
     Lucknow Pact, 39, 70  
     Pakistan Resolution, 17, 121  
     Resolution re. Turkey, 75-6  
     Revival, 120  
 All India Nationalist League, 161  
 All India Students' Congress, 199  
 All India Trade Union Congress, 102, 130, 153, 199  
 All India Women Conference, 129, 174, 195-6  
 All Parties Conference (1922), 83  
 All Parties Conference (1928), 73  
 All Parties Convention (1928), 74  
*Alsar*, The, 60  
 Amanullah, King, 59, 80, 95-9, 132  
     Abdication, 98  
     Indian visit, 97  
     Reforms, 97-8  
 American Seclusion Bill (1921), 87  
 Amin, Raoji I, 47  
 Amir Ali, Syed, 13, 15  
*Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 29, 37, 41, 43, 49, 99  
*Ananda Bazar Patrika*, 44  
 Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act (1919), 70  
 Andrews, C.F., 7, 43  
 Aney, Mr, 137  
 Anglo-American Association in China, 88  
 Anglo-Burmese War, 3rd, 28  
 Anglo-Indian and European Defence League, 8  
 Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902), 39-40, 46  
 Anglo-Russian agreement (1907), 39, 48  
 Anglo-Russian rivalry, 40  
 Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba, 60  
 Ansari, M.A., 25, 73, 77, 78, 81, 83, 95, 108, 109  
 Ansari, Muhammad Mian, 59  
 Ansari, Mukhtar Ahmad, 55  
 Anti-Fascist Peoples' Freedom League of Burma, 140  
 Anwar Pasha, 59  
 Arab High Committee, 142, 144  
 Arab League, 204, 214  
 Archbold, W.A.J., 37  
 Ariff, Cossim, 52  
 Arya Samaj, 7  
 Asaf Ali, 100, 143, 193, 204  
 Asia, South East, 87, 132-4, 193  
 Asian Relations Conference (1947), 92, 95, 205-22, 231

- Asian Relations Organisation, 212-7  
 Asiatic Association, Shanghai, 91, 92  
 Asiatic Federation, 108-10, 130, 139-40, 174-9, 204-5, 231-2  
 Asquith, Lord, 56  
 Atal, M., 155, 165  
 Atlee, C.R., 191, 192  
 Attiya, 203  
 August Offer, 122  
 Aung San, 139, 140, 202, 204, 209  
 Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam, 24, 48, 56, 58, 73, 83, 84, 95, 120, 121, 123, 126, 159, 168, 194, 195, 200, 202, 203, 204  
 Azizul-Haque, Muhammad, 73  
  
 Ba Naw, 134  
 Ba Pe, U., 134  
 Bacha-i-Saqo, 98  
 Balfour Declaration, 141, 142, 146  
 Balkan wars, 53-8  
 Bandarnaike, Lady, 175  
 Bandarnaike, Mr., 209, 211  
 Bande Matram, 121  
 Bandung Conference (1955), 95, 222, 231  
 Banerjee, Hem Chandra, 6, 27  
 Banerjee, R.D., 5  
 Banerjee, Surendra Nath, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 35, 40, 70  
 Banerjee, W.C., II, 13  
 Barbusse, Henri, 105  
 Barkatullah, 58, 59, 95  
 Barker, A.J., 173  
 Basheer Ahmed, 98  
 Basu, Ananda Mohan, 7  
 Beck, Principal, 14, 15  
 Bengal partition, 36, 41, 50  
*Bengali, The*, 42, 45, 94  
 Bentham, J., 5  
 Bergmann, Hugo, 209  
 Besant, Annie, 8, 39, 44  
 Bhagat Singh, 75, 130  
 Bhandarkar, R. G., 5, 8  
 Bhattacharjee, G.P., 130  
 Bhattacharya, Chapala Kant, 101  
 Bhurgri, 108  
 Bihar famine, 46  
 Birkenhead, Lord, 72  
 Bombay Association, 9  
*Bombay Chronicle*, 137  
 Bombay Naval Ratings, 196  
 Bombay Presidency Association, 9-10  
 Bopp, 5  
 Bose, Mrinal Kanti, 193, 198, 199  
 Bose, Nandlal, 87  
 Bose, Raj Narain, 5, 6  
 Bose, Rash Bihari, 47, 151, 169, 170  
 Bose, Sarat Chandra, 152, 193, 196, 198, 199, 200, 204  
 Bose, Subhas Chandra, 74, 127, 139, 166, 168-73, 230  
     On Sino-Japanese hostilities, 152, 155  
 Boycott Movement (China), 99-100  
 Brahmo Samaj, 7  
 British-India Society, 9  
 British Indian Association, 9  
 British Rule  
     Benefits, 3-4  
 Buchan, 38  
 Bureaucracy, 2  
 Burma, 27, 40, 61, 92, 193, 201, 202  
     Annexation to Indian Empire, 29-30  
     Nationalism, 92-3, 134-40  
     1938 revolt, 138  
     Whitr Paper (1945), 140  
 Burma-China Road, 158  
 Burma Round Table Conference, 135  
  
 Cabinet Mission, 191-2  
 Cairo Conference (1943), 216  
 Caste system, 46  
 Central Mohammedan Association of Calcutta, 13, 60  
 Ceylon-India relations, 127-30, 201, 202  
 Chakravarti, Amiya, 90  
 Chakravarti, P.C., 99  
 Chakravarty, Shyam Sunder, 57  
 Chaman Lall, Diwan, 196  
 Chandan Singh, Thakur, 94  
 Chandavarkar, N.G., 3, 8  
 Chang Yin-Fun, 209  
 Charyulu, A. Govinda, 109  
 Charkha Movement (Nepal), 94  
 Chatterjee, Bankim Chandra, 6, 27  
 Chatterjee, Nandlal, 10  
 Chatterjee, Ramananda, 46  
 Chattopadhyaya, Kamaladevi, 159  
 Chauri Chaura incident, 71  
 Chelmsford, Lord, 39  
 Cheng Yin-Fun, 159  
 Chiang Kai Shek, 156, 157, 159, 163, 164, 165, 166, 200  
     India visit, 160-2  
     Meeting with Gandhiji, 160-1  
 Chiang Kai Shek, Madame, 90, 156, 157, 159, 200  
 China, 27, 28, 32, 61, 199, 201, 229  
     Opium trade, 29  
 China Defence League, 158  
 China-India Committee in London, 152  
 China-India relations, 47-8, 87-8, 99-108, 150-67  
     Indian Medical Mission, 103  
     Indian troops, 101-5  
 China Relief Fund, 153

- Chinese Revolution (1911), 6,48  
 Chintamani, C.Y., 80  
 Chirol, Valentine 8, 44, 47  
 Chit Hlaing, U., 134  
 Chiu, S.Y., 87  
 Chotani, Mohammed, 76  
 Chou En Lai, 200  
 Christian Missionaries, 3  
*Christian Science Monitor*, 91  
 Christianity, 27-8  
 Chu Chia Hua 158  
 Chu Teh, 153, 158, 200  
 Chung-king, 159  
 Churchill, Winston W, 160, 161  
 Civil disobedience movement, 71, 75, 118, 119, 122, 159  
 Civil service, 1  
     Entrance age, 8, 9  
 Clemenceau, 110  
 Coke, John, 14  
*Comrade*, 52, 55, 95  
 Communal Award, 119  
 Communist Party of China, 151  
 Congress Against Imperialism, 1927, Brussels, 24  
 Congress of oppressed Nationalities (1927), 104-7  
 Connemara, Lord, 12  
 Constitutional Party of Indo-China, 95  
 Coomaraswamy, Ananda, 27  
 Cotton, Henry, 2, 5, 16, 40  
 Cotton import duty, 8  
 Crew, 57  
 Cripps, Stafford, 122, 191  
 Cripps Mission, 122-3, 170  
 Cunningham, 5  
 Cursum Chang, 88  
 Curzon, Lord, 12, 24, 36, 40, 47  
     Calcutta University convocation address, 40-1  
     Imperialist policy, 40-1  
  
 Dandi March, 118  
 Dange, S. A., 199  
 Das, B., 136  
 Das, C. R., 71, 108, 109  
 Das, Sanghamugha, 130  
 Das, Taraknath, 96  
 Dassenaik, S.W., 176  
 Day of Deliverance, 121  
 Dayananda, Swami, 7  
 Desai Bhulabhai, 126, 152, 173  
 Deshmukh, Gopal Hari, 8  
 De Silva, C. J. C., 176  
 De Silva, M.W.H., 202  
 Dilke, Charles, 2  
 Direct Action Day, 192  
 Divide and rule policy, 37  
 Dobama Asia Yone (Burma), 139  
  
 Dorji, J.P., 209  
 Doung Can Gieu, 95  
 Drain theory, 4  
 Dufferin, Lord, 11, 12  
     St. Andrews Day Dinner speech, 12  
 Dutt, Batukeshwar, 75  
 Dutt, R. C., 4  
 Dutt Choudhry, Rambhuj, 78  
 Dutta, Madhusudan, 6  
  
 East India Association of London, 9  
 Ebrahim, Currimbhoy, 55  
 Economic grievances, 3-4  
 Egypt, 48, 51, 149, 202  
 Einstein, Albert, 105  
 Elections (1937), 120  
 Elections (1945), 190-1  
     Congress manifesto, 204  
 Elgin, Lord, 31  
 Elmhirst, Lord, 89  
 Elphinstone, Mounstuart, 6  
  
 Far-East, 150-74  
 Fazl-i-Husain, Mian, 49  
 Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, 137  
 Fisher, Louis, 163  
 Foreign goods boycott, 45, 46  
*Forward*, The, 102  
 Free Press of India, 93  
 Fujiwara Iwaichi, 169  
  
 Gafoor, Dr. Abdul, 56  
 Gandhi, M.K., 25, 42, 73, 74, 78, 105, 123, 156, 157, 217, 228  
     Advent on political scene, 69-70  
     Arrested (April 1919), 70; (May 1930), 118; (January 1932), 119; (August 1933), 119; (August 1942), 124  
     Burma visit, 135  
     Ceylon visit, 93  
     Khilafat movement, 76-87  
     Letter to Every Japanese, 163  
     Meeting with Chiang Kai Shek, 160-1  
     Non-cooperation movement, 70-1  
     On Anglo-Afghan relations, 96; Cabinet Mission Plan, 191; Chinese revolution, 100, 107; Indian troops to China, 101; Japanese aggression, 162-3; Nehru's Ceylon visit, 127, 128; Palestine question, 146; Sino-Japanese hostilities, 155, 160  
     Sympathy for Burma, 92  
 Gandhi-Irwin Pact, 118  
 Gandhi-Jinnah talks (1944), 125-6  
 Ganguli, J. M., 167  
 George, Lloyd, 75, 77, 79

**Germany**

Unification, 6  
 Ghalibnama, 59  
 Ghose, Lal Mohan, 40  
 Ghose, Rash Behari, 35, 37  
 Ghosh, Aurobindo, 6, 36  
 Ghosh, Sisir Kumar, 9  
 Gill, Niranjan Singh, 170  
 Gokhale, Gopal Krishana, 3, 10, 16, 17, 35, 42, 48  
 Golam Hussain, 48  
 Goonesinha, A. E., 176  
 Goswami, T. C., 102-3  
 Government of India Act (1919), 39, 75  
 Government of India Act (1935), 119  
 Greco-Turkish War (1897), 31, 32  
 Grew, Edward, 48  
 Grover, B. L., 10  
 Gunawardhena, D.C., 129  
 Gurkha League, 94

Habibullah Khan, Amir, 59

*Hablul Matin*, 52

*Hamdard*, 52, 95

Hamilton, George, 2, 12

Hamilton, Lord, 31

Hardinge, Lord, 35, 56, 57, 58

*Harijan*, The, 162

Harish Chandra, Bhartendu, 6

Hasrat Mohani, Maulana, 83

Hatta, Mohammed, 105

Hedjaz Railway, 49

Henderson, William, 217

Hindu-Urdu controversy, 14

*Hindu*, The, 90, 133, 154, 159, 165, 200, 206

Hindu Mahasabha, 94, 96, 97, 102, 124, 131, 139, 166, 178, 193

*Hindustan Review*, 41

*Hindustan Standard*, 92, 133

*Hindustan Times*, 151-2, 166

Hindustani Seva Dal, 102

Hirohito, Emperor, 174

Hiroshi, Oshimo, 168-9

*Hitavadi*, The, 47

Ho-Chi Minh, 198

Hon Liang Chi Chao, 87

Hopkins, Garland, 221

Houghton, Bernard, 2

Hsieh, S.T., 156

Hsu Chi Mo, 87

Hu Shih, 87

Hu Shin, 89

Hume, A.O., 1, 10, 11

Open letter to Calcutta University Graduates, 10-11

Hunter, W. W., 13

Hunter Committee Report, 70, 80

Ilbert Bill, 8-9, 13

Imperial Durbar (1877), 8, 10

Inahara, Kat Sugi, 171

Inayatullah, King, 98

India League, 9

Indian Arms Act, 8

Indian Association, 7, 9

Indian Council of World Affairs, 206, 215

*Indian Daily Mail*, 137

Indian Independence League, 169-70

Indian League in London, 140, 193

Indian Medical Mission to China, 155, 165, 166-7

*Indian Mirror*, The, 16

Indian Mutiny (1857), 13, 43

Indian National Army, 170-3

Trial, 190

Indian National Congress

Declaration independence aim, 118

Early years, 11-2 ; Official attitude, 12

Extremists, 35-7

First session, 4, 11

Forerunners, 9-10

Lucknow Pact, 39, 70

Ministries (1937-39), 120-1

Moderates, 34

Muslim delegates, 16

Origin, 9-11

Surat session (1907), 37

Indian National Liberal Federation, 81, 83

Indian National Union, 11

Indian Press, 6, 32

*Indian Review*, 41

*Indian Social Reformer*, 53

*Indian Textile Journal*, 45

Indian United Patriotic Association, 15

Indian Volunteers Army, 199

Indochina, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199

Indonesia, 193, 194-5, 196-7, 199

Indonesian Conference (1949), 231

*Indu Prakash*, 36

Institute of Pacific Relations, 133, 173

Interim Government, 192

International Labour Organisation, 176

International Peace Campaign, Geneva, 152

Iqbal, Muhammad, 52, 97

Iran, 148-9, 202

Iraq, 149

Irwin, Lord, 75, 118

Ishak, Professor, 31

*Islam Rabi*, 52

Italo-Turkish War, 39, 50, 3

Hindu press, 53

Italy

Unification, 6

Iwakuro, Col., 169, 170

Iyengar, Ramaswami, 100

- Iyengar, S. Srinivas, 74, 100, 102, 109  
 Iyer, G. S., 4, 10  
 Iyer, Ramaswami, 78  
  
 Jain, M.S., 38  
 Jallianwalla Bagh massacre, 70, 81  
 Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, 83, 144, 147  
 Jamal Pasha, 59  
 Japan, 27, 45-7, 87, 94-5, 150, 166-74, 201, 213, 229  
     Attack on China, 150-9, 230  
     Imperialism, 94  
     Indian students, 45, 46  
     Vivekananda's visit, 31-2  
 Japan India Society, 45  
 Japan-India trade, 45  
*Japan Weekly Mail*, 46  
*Japanese Chronicle*, 46  
 Japanese press, 46  
 Java, 196  
 Jayakar, M.R., 71, 73, 136, 161  
 Jinha, M. A., 39, 60, 70, 71, 72-3, 74, 78, 81, 120, 136, 148, 149, 150, 178, 196, 198  
     On Palestine problem, 143, 145, 147, 148; Quit India movement, 124  
     Resigned from Congress, 70  
 Jogendra Singh, Sardar, 175  
 Joint electorate, 73  
 Jones, F. C., 173  
 Jones, William, 5  
 Joshi, K. M., 176, 177  
 Joshi, P. C., 193  
 Joshi, S. C., 176  
 Junankar, N. S., 220  
 Jwang, E., 176  
  
*Kal*, The, 47  
 Kamraj Nadar, 194  
*Kayastha Samachar*, 41  
 Kelkar, N.C., 71, 131  
 Kemal Pasha, Mustafa, 72, 82, 83, 84, 97  
 Ker, J. Campbell, 44  
*Keshari*, 42, 45  
 Khadilkar, R.K., 194  
 Khalid Beg, 58  
 Khaliq-uz-Zaman, Chowdhary, 150, 178  
 Khan, Syed Ahmed, 13, 17, 30, 31  
 Khilafat movement, 70, 72, 75-87, 96, 109  
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Husain, 49  
 Kikukawa, T., 176-7  
 Kitchlew, Dr., 81  
 Kohn, Hans, 49  
 Koirala, B.P., 131  
 Koirala, Krishna Prasad, 94  
 Konoye, Prince, 167  
 Koo, Dr., 159  
 Korea, 41  
  
 Kripalani, J.B., 198, 199, 201-2, 205  
 Krishana Menon, V.K., 193  
 Kunzru, H.N., 173, 195  
 Kuomintang Party, 151, 157  
 Kyaw Myint, U., 134, 137  
  
 Labour Government (UK), 190  
 Lajpat Rai, Lala, 3, 16, 35, 36, 37, 42, 47, 73, 80, 82, 102  
 Laljee, Hosseinbhoy A., 202  
 Landholders Society, 9  
 Lanka Sama Samaj Party, 127  
 Lanka Sundaram, 128  
 Latif, Abdul, 13  
 Lawrence, Pethick, 191  
 Lawton, Lancelot, 46  
*Leader*, The, 137, 138  
 League Against Imperialism, 106-7  
 League of Nations, 109, 145, 151, 152  
 League of the Oppressed Peoples, 95  
 Leakat Hussain, 56  
 Lebanon, 149, 150  
 Levi, Werner, 33, 217, 219  
 Liang Chi-Chao, 88  
 Liberal Party, 49  
 Liberalism, 1, 5  
 Linlithgow, Lord, 120, 121  
 Lohia, Ram Manohar, 131  
*London Times*, The, 163  
 Lovett, 44  
 Lytton, Lord, 1, 4, 8  
  
 M. A. O. College, Aligarh, 14, 54  
 MacDonald, Ramsay, 38, 74, 119  
 Madani, R. P., 96  
 Madras Mahajan Sabha, 10  
 Madras Liberal League, 76  
 Mahendra Pratap, Raja, 58, 59, 95, 167  
 Mahmud Hassan, Maulana, 59, 96  
 Mahmudabad, Raja of, 145  
*Mahratta*, The, 53  
 Maine, Henry, 1, 5  
 Mai The Chau, 198, 209, 213  
 Majumdar, R.C., 5, 85  
 Malabari, M., 8, 10  
 Malaviya, Madan Mohan, 2, 35, 71, 78, 79, 80, 94, 102  
 Malaya, 132-3, 155, 193, 201  
 Malik, Hafiz, 16  
 Mallik, D N., 95  
 Man Singh, Khadga, 130  
 Man Singh, Khanda, 130  
*Manchester Guardian*, 206  
 Manchurian crisis, 150-1  
 Mandalik, Viswanath Narayan, 8  
 Mansergh, Nicholas, 220

- Mao Tse Tung, 158, 165, 200  
 Mao Tun, 88-9  
 Marshall, John, 5  
 Masani, M.R., 143  
 Mathura Singh, 59  
 Maung Maung, 93  
 Maung Maungji, 134, 137,  
 Mazhar-ul-Haq, 39, 48, 54, 57  
 Mehdi Ali Khan, Nawab, 37  
 Mehta, Jamnadas, 176, 177  
 Metha, Pheroz Shah, 9, 29, 35  
 Mesopotamia, 106-7  
 Middle East, 140-50, 201, 202-3  
 Mill, John Stuart, 5  
 Minglun Sayadaw, 134  
 Minto, Lady, 35  
 Minto, Lord, 37, 38, 49  
 Minto-Morley Reforms (1909), 38  
 Mitra, Dinbandu, 6  
 Mitra, Kishori Chandra, 8  
 Mitra, N. N., 90  
 Mitra, Rajendra Lal, 5, 6  
 Mitra, Satya, 4  
 Mitter, B.L., 151  
 Mitter, Ramesh Chandra, 13  
 Moderate Conference (1919), 78  
*Modern Review*, 99, 129, 132  
 Mohammed Ali, 55, 56, 79, 82, 86, 95, 96, 100,  
 101, 108, 109  
 Mohammedan Anglo Oriental Defence Associa-  
 tion of Upper India, 15  
 Mohammedan Association, 13  
 Mohammedan Literary and Scientific Society,  
 Calcutta, 13  
 Mohan Singh, Captain, 169, 170  
 Mohmed Ali, 78  
 Mohsin-ul-Mulk, 37, 49-50  
 Montague, E. S., 38, 96  
 Montague-Chelmsford Reforms, 39  
 Moonje, B. S., 71, 136, 162  
 Moosi Raza, Imam, 48  
 Moplahs, 72  
 Morison, Principal, 14  
 Morley, Lord, 2, 37, 38, 43, 49  
 Mountbatten, Lord, 192  
 Mudaliar, Ramaswami, 136  
 Mudholkar, R. N., 57  
 Muhammad, Nawab Syed, 57  
 Muhammad Ali, Maulana, 37, 38  
*Muhammadi*, 52, 56  
 Mukherjee, Shyama Prasad, 193, 200, 204  
 Muhammad Shafi, 73, 97  
 Mukhopadhyay, Bhudev, 6  
 Muller, Max, 5  
 Munro, Thomas, 6  
 Muslim nationalism, 12-7  
 Mustafa Momin, 213  
 Nadir Khan, 99, 132  
 Nag, D S., 205  
 Nag, Kalidas, 87  
 Naidu, Sarojini, 109, 175, 194, 209, 221  
 Nair, Sankaran, 5  
 Naoroji, Dadabhai, 3, 4, 12, 35  
 Narayan, Jayaprakash, 131  
 Nasrullah Khan, Sardar, 59  
 National Committee for India's Freedom, 140  
 National Liberal Federation, 158  
 National Mohammedan Association, 13  
 National Party, 71  
 Nationalism  
     Asian consciousness, 23-34  
     Factors, 1-12  
 Navy strike, 190, 191, 196  
 Nehru, Jawaharlal, 5, 17, 24, 25, 42, 54, 72, 73,  
 74, 80, 84, 98, 164, 165, 168, 194, 202, 228  
     Advice to Japan (1946), 201  
     At Asian Relations Conference (1947), 206,  
     207-9, 210, 217, 218, 220, 222, 231  
     At Congress of Oppressed Nationalities, 105-6;  
     Burma visit, 138  
     Ceylon visit, 127-8  
     China visit, 156-8  
     Forms Interim Government, 192  
     Malaya visit, 132  
     On Asiatic Federation, 130, 140, 177-8, 204-5;  
     Burmese question, 137, 140; Chinese revolu-  
     tion, 103; Cripps Mission, 123; Gandhi-  
     Irwin Pact, 118-19; Government of India Act  
     (1935), 119; Indonesian question, 195, 196,  
     197; Japanese aggression, 162; Medical Mis-  
     sion to China, 167; Middle East, 204; Pales-  
     tine question, 142, 143, 145-6, 147; Sino-  
     Japanese hostilities, 151, 152, 154; Vietnam  
     issue, 198  
     Requested Jinnah to join Congress, 121  
     South East Asia visit, 206  
 Nehru, Motilal, 71, 73, 77, 79, 80, 100  
 Nehru Report, 73-4  
 Nepal, 94, 130-2  
*New York Herald Tribune*, 220  
*New York Times*, 221  
*News Chronicle* (London), 221  
 Noguchi, 155  
 Non-cooperation movement, 70-1, 79-81  
*North China Star*, 157  
 Obedullah Sindhi, Maulana, 59  
 Obeidullah, 95, 96  
*Official Central Daily News*, 164  
 Ohkuma, Shigenou, 47  
 Okakura Kakuzo, 27, 32, 39

- Okazaki, 168  
 Okuma, Count, 45  
 Opium trade (China), 29, 48  
 Orient Bank of India, 55  
 Ottama, U., 93, 134  
 Ozaki, Lt. Col., 169  
  
*Paisa Akhbar*, 51, 52  
 Pal, Bipin Chandra, 4, 6, 7, 27, 36, 56, 57, 80  
 Palestine problem, 141-8, 149, 150, 202, 203, 228, 229-30  
 Pan-Asiatic Conference (1926), 104  
 Pan-Asiatic Labour Conference (1934), 176-7  
 Pan Asiaism, 39-61  
 Pan-Islamic Army, 59  
 Pan-Islamism, 30-1, 48-61, 75  
 Pandit, Vijay Lakshmi, 133, 140, 160, 174, 193, 194  
 Pandurang, Dadoba, 8  
 Panikkar, K. M., 26, 178, 220  
 Pantulu, Viresalingam, 8  
 Paris Peace Conference, 76  
 Patel, Vallabhbhai, 71, 119, 136, 164, 195, 200  
 Pati, Mrs., Rukmuni Lakshmi, 93  
 Patriotic Association, 17  
 Paul Fang, 140, 166  
 Peace and Empire Conference (1938), 145  
 Peking Lecture Association, 87  
 Perara, N. H., 129  
 Perry, E., 1  
 Persia, 40, 48-9, 51, 61  
 Philippines, 197  
 Phule, Jotiba Govind, 8  
 Pitaka Niketan, 87  
 Pohekar, G. S., 91  
*Political Bhomiyo*, 53  
 Poona Pact, 119  
 Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, 10  
 Poverty, 4  
 Prachanda Gorkha (Nepal), 130  
 Pradhan, R. G., 8  
 Praja Parishad (Nepal), 131  
 Prakash, Sir, 98  
 Prasad, Bimal, 107  
 Prasad, Rajendra, 37, 71, 156, 162, 193  
 Prince of Wales visit (1905), 37  
 Provisional Government of Azad Hind, 171  
 Provisional Government of India (Kabul), 59, 95-6  
*Punjabee*, The, 53  
  
 Quit Asia Day, 194  
 Quit India Movement, 124, 131, 164, 171  
  
 Racial discrimination, 2  
 Radhakrishnan, S., 165  
  
 Rafi, A. K., 176  
 Rajagopalachari, C., 71, 80, 86, 125, 138, 162  
 Rajwade, Lakshmibai G., 174  
 Ram Krishna, 7  
 Ranade, M. G., 5, 8  
 Ranga, N.G., 196  
 Rangachariar, T., 136  
 Ranglal, 6  
 Rao, V. K. R. V., 210  
 Ratcliffe, S. K., 11  
 Red Crescent Society, 51, 55, 56  
 Reddi, Muthu Lakshmi, 175  
 Regional integration, 174-9  
 Regmi, D. R., 131  
 Religious reforms, 7-8  
 Responsivist Party, 71  
 Reza Shah, 148-149  
 Ripon, Lord, 8, 10  
 Rolland, Romain, 89, 105  
 Ronaldshay, Lord, 29  
 Roosevelt, President, 160, 164  
 Round Table Conference, 75, 118-19, 134, 136, 137  
 Rousseau, J. J., 5  
 Rowlatt Act, 69-70, 81  
 Roy, Govinda Chandra, 6  
 Roy, M. N., 151  
 Roy, P. C., 59  
 Roy, Ram Mohan, 7, 8, 27  
 Royal Commission on Palestine, 144, 16  
 Rushbrook Williams, L. F., 44  
 Russell, Bertrand, 105  
 Russell, William, 2  
 Russian Revolution (1905), 6  
 Russian Revolution (1917), 6  
 Russo-Japanese War (1905), 6, 35, 41-5, 92  
 Russo-Turkish War (1877-78), 30  
  
 Sahajananda Saraswati, Swami, 162  
 Sahay, Ananda Mohan, 170  
 Saklatwala, 100  
 Salisbury, Lord, 5  
 San Francisco Conference (1945), 133, 140, 216  
 Sangathan movement, 72  
 Sankara, Bikshu, 127  
 Santhanam, K., 210  
 Sanyal, Nalinakshya, 95  
 Sapru, Tej Bahadur, 70, 72, 80, 100, 126, 161  
 Sarda, Har Bilas, 7  
 Sastri, Srinivas, 70  
 Satyamurti, S., 80, 95, 100, 139, 152  
 Satyananda Puri, Swami, 169  
 Satyapal, Dr., 98  
 Savarkar, V.D., 125-6, 131, 139  
 Saw, U., 202  
 Sayani, R. M., 16

- Sayed Ahmed, Shamsul Ulema, 60  
 Sayeed, Khalib B., 14  
 Sayegusa, Shighetomo, 171  
 Seely, 3  
 Sen, Keshab Chandra, 7, 26, 27, 32, 228  
     On Asian unity, 27-9  
 Sen, Kshitimohan, 87  
 Senanayake, Mr., 217  
 Separate electorate, 39, 73  
 Servants of Caba, 54  
 Servants of India Society, 35  
 Shakespeare, Mr., 14  
 Shariar, Sultan, 197, 209, 210  
 Sharma, B. N., 78  
 Shaikat Ali, 54, 58, 73, 79, 97, 132  
 Shelly Wang, 166  
 Shibusawa, Elichi, 46  
 Shiva Prasad, Raja, 15  
 Shiva Rao, 133, 136  
 Sradhananda, Swami, 72, 78, 79  
 Shridharani, Krishnalal, 178, 218  
 Shuddhi movement, 72  
 Shujullah, Dr., 59  
 Siam, 197  
 Siddiqui, Abdur Rahman, 195, 204  
 Sikandar Hyat Khan, 149  
 Silk Letters Conspiracy, 59-60  
 Silva, Colvin'd 129  
 Simla Conference (1945), 126  
 Simon Commission, 72-3, 135  
 Sinha, S. P., 35, 39  
 Sino-Japanese hostilities, 150-9  
 Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, 10  
 Smedley, Agnes, 153  
 Smith, Dunlop, 37  
 So Nyun, U., 135  
 So Theim, U., 134  
 Social reforms, 7-8  
 Soekarno, 90, 194-5  
 Sonakul Dhani, 90  
 Souriya, Queen, 97, 98  
 Spencer, Herbert, 5  
 Sri Ram, 207  
*Star of India*, 142, 215  
*Statesman*, The, 60, 160  
 Strachey, John, 1, 3, 14  
 Suderi, Zia-ud-Din Ahmed, 85  
 Suez Canal, 24  
 Suhrawardy, Dr., 52  
 Suhrawardy, H.S., 147  
 Sujuki, E., 176  
 Sujuki, K., 176  
 Sun Fo, Dr., 165  
 Sun Yat Sen, 48, 99, 103  
 Sun Yat Sen, Madam, 103, 105, 158  
 Sundaram, Kanga, 176  
 Suraj Mal, Captain, 172  
 Swaminathan, Mrs. Ammu, 194  
 Swaraj Party, 71-2  
 Syria, 149, 150  
  
*Ta Kung Pao*, The, 164-5  
 Tablig movement, 72  
 Tagore, Debendra Nath, 3, 7  
 Tagore, Dwijendra Nath, 6  
 Tagore, Rabindra Nath, 6, 27, 29, 32, 39, 41, 42,  
     87, 88, 156, 167, 175  
     China visit, 88-90, 91  
     Japan visit, 90  
     On Sino-Japanese hostilities, 151, 153, 155  
     Pan-Asian ideas, 39  
     South-East Asia visit, 90-1, 95  
 Tai Chi Tao, 159  
 Taka Kusu, J., 87  
 Taki Fujia, Miss, 175  
 Tanaka, Naokichi, 171  
 Tanzim movement, 72  
 Tao, Prof., 155  
 Tarkhandkar, Dadoba Pandurang, 2  
 Telang, K.T., 5, 8, 9  
 Terauchi, Count, 172  
 Than Tun, 139  
 Theophist movement, 8  
 Thivy, Mr., 210  
 Tibet, 40  
 Tilak, Bal Gangadhar, 2, 3, 5, 35, 36, 37, 39, 42,  
     45, 85, 110  
*Times*, The (London), 220  
*Times of India*, 56  
 Tohjo, Hideki, 170, 171  
 Toyama, Mitsuru, 47  
 Treaty of Laussane, 84  
 Treaty of Severs, 79-80, 83, 84  
*Tribune*, The, 53, 137  
*Tripura Hitaishi*, 44  
 Tsiang, T.F., 164  
 Tsiang Fe, 165  
 Tufail Ahmed, 38  
 Tulsi Meher, 94  
 Turkey-India relations, 48-61, 75  
 Tyabji, Badruddin, 9, 15, 16  
  
 Udai Shankar, 152  
 United Nations, 211, 217, 220, 222, 231, 232  
 Upadhyaya, K.P., 131  
*Ur-in-Najaf*, 52  
  
 Vaidya, K.B., 165, 166  
*Vakil*, 51, 52, 60  
 Verma, Ravindra, 198-9  
 Vernacular Press Act, 8  
 Victoria, Queen, 30

- Vidyasagar, Ishwar Chandra, 6, 8  
 Vietnam, 198-9  
 Vivekananda, Swami, 7-8, 27, 39, 42  
     Japan visit, 31-2, 39  
 Von Hentig, Dr., 58  
  
 Wacha, Dishnaw, 30  
 Wahabi movement, 13  
 Wali, Maulana Qutubuddin Abdul, 142  
 Wang Ching Wei, 167  
 Wasti, Syed Razi, 38  
*Watan*, 51  
 Wavell, Lord, 126, 190, 192  
 Wedderburn, 11  
 Wellington Koo, V.K., 153  
 Western education, 5, 10, 12  
 Whitehead, H., 12  
 Wilkins, Charles, 5  
 Wilson, H.H., 5  
 Women Association of Indonesia, 175  
 World Parliamentary Congress of Arab and  
     Muslim Countries for the Defence of Palestine,  
     146  
 World War I, 38, 39, 58, 69, 84, 87, 107, 148  
 World War II, 120-1, 123, 140, 148, 160, 190  
 World Youth Peace Congress (1928), 95,  
     103  
  
 Yagnik, Indulal, 85  
 Yakub, Md., 143, 144  
 Yakub Hassan, 76  
 Yeh Chien-Ying, 156  
*Young India*, 92, 96, 107  
 Young Men's Buddhist Association, 92, 93  
 Young Thakins (Burma), 139  
 Young Turk Movement, 6  
 Young Turk Revolution (1908), 48  
 Younghusband Mission, 40  
  
 Zafar Ali, 55  
 Zafar Ali Khan, 55, 95, 99  
 Zafrullah Khan, 190  
*Zamindar*, 51, 52, 55, 95  
 Zamindary Association of Bengal, 9  
 Zhukhov, 221





